

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLICKÉHO JAZYKA A DIDAKTIKY

**Událostní předměty po slovesech *have/take (have/take a little look)* a jejich
překladové ekvivalenty**

**Eventive objects after the verbs *have/take (have/take a little look)* and their
translation equivalents**

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Zpracovala: Jana Křístková

Obor: Anglistika a amerikanistika

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: PhDr. Pavlína Šaldová, Ph.D.

Praha, květen 2009

Děkuji vedoucí své bakalářské práce PhDr. Pavlíně Šaldové, PhD za její ochotu a pomoc při konzultacích spojených s psaním práce.

„Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a že jsem uvedla všechny použité prameny a literaturu. Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce ke studijním účelům.“

Praha, 29. května 2009

Jana Křístková

“I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned. I have no objections to the BA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.”

Abstrakt

Bakalářská práce se zabývá analýzou v českém jazyce neexistující anglické verbonominální konstrukce, která se skládá ze sémanticky vyprázdněného slovesa, v případě této práce *have* a *take*, v kombinaci s událostním předmětem. Tato dvoučlenná konstrukce tvoří jednu sémantickou jednotku, což může být dokázáno parafrází, ve které událostní předmět nahradí sloveso a zároveň nedojde ke změně významu. Konstrukce je zajímavá tím, že mění význam slovesa z hlediska vidu, což se odráží v českém překladu, a zároveň umožňuje snadnější použití modifikace a kvantifikace. Druh determinace a přítomnost modifikace má pak důsledky pro český překlad, konkrétně pro vid českého slovesa v překladu. Modifikátory se většinou překládají do češtiny jako adverbia, popřípadě jako adjektiva modifikující syntaktický předmět v případě překladu verbonominální konstrukcí. Zároveň někdy integrace adverbíí do věty v českém překladu činí problémy.

Práce shrnuje teoretický přehled informací o této verbonominální konstrukci a dále pracuje se 140 autentickými příklady získaných pomocí softwaru ParaConc pro práci s vícejazyčnými korpusy ze tří současných románů napsaných rodilými mluvčími angličtiny. Tyto příklady se liší mírou své idiomatičnosti, a proto jsou rozříděny a popsány nejen vzhledem k idiomatičnosti, ale i své struktuře. Následně jsou analyzovány s ohledem na přítomnost a druh determinace a modifikace, z čehož jsou na základě českých překladových ekvivalentů vyvozeny závěry, jaké dopady má tato konstrukce pro český překlad.

Abstract

This thesis analyzes one English syntactic construction which does not exist in Czech, i.e. the eventive object construction which consists of a light verb, in the case of this thesis *have* and *take*, which is complemented by an eventive object having the form of a deverbal noun morphologically identical with a simple verb. Although the construction is bipartite from the syntactic perspective, it represents one semantic unit which can be proved by a possible paraphrase in which the object replaces the construction as the verb of the clause without a change of meaning. The use of this construction modifies affects the aspectual features of the verb, which is reflected in Czech translation equivalents. Furthermore, the construction allows for easier modification and qualification. The kind and presence of determiner and modifier has an influence on the Czech translation, most importantly the aspect. Modifiers usually translate as adverbs or adjectives modifying a syntactic object, if the translation equivalent in Czech is a verbo-nominal construction.

The thesis comprises on the one hand a theoretical survey of information on the topic, and on the other hand provides linguistic description of 140 examples of the construction from three English texts written by contemporary native speakers of English, as well as their Czech translation equivalents. The examples are provided using ParaConc, concordance software for multilingual parallel corpora. The examples are classified and described with respect to the degree of their idiomaticity, the presence and kind of determiner and modifier. In combination with the description of the English examples, the analysis of the Czech translation equivalents is the basis for conclusions on the influence of the construction on the translation from English to Czech.

Content

1. Introduction	7
2. Theoretical Background	8
2.1. Terminology	8
2.2. Elements of the construction	9
2.2.1. The verb	9
2.2.1.1. Light verb	10
2.2.1.2. Have and take	10
2.2.2. The object	12
2.2.2.1. The direct object	13
2.2.2.2. The indirect object	13
2.2.2.3. The eventive object	15
2.2.3. The expanded predicate construction	17
2.2.3.1. Formal features	18
2.2.3.2. Motivation of the expanded predicate	23
2.2.3.3. Use of have and take with respect to registers and varieties of English	24
2.2.4. Formal tests and conditions determining the expanded predicate	25
3. Material and Method	27
3.1. Material	27
3.2. Method	28
3.2.1. Paraconc	28
3.2.2. Excerpton of the examples	28
4. Analysis	31
4.1. Syntactic Types	31
4.1.1. Have	32
4.1.2. Take	38
4.2. Determination and modification	46
5. Conclusion	53
6. Bibliography	59
7. Resumé	60
8. Appendix	63
8.1. Have – list of examples	63
8.2. Take – list of examples	67

1. Introduction

This thesis describes and analyzes one English syntactic construction which does not exist in Czech, i.e. the eventive object construction. It consists of a light verb, in the case of this thesis *have* and *take*, which is complemented by an eventive object having the form of a deverbal noun morphologically identical with a simple verb to which it is semantically related. Although from the syntactic perspective the construction is bipartite, from the semantic perspective the construction represents one semantic unit, where the verb expresses the verbal categories, while the eventive object carries the lexical meaning. The fact that the construction forms one semantic unit can be proved by a possible paraphrase in which the object replaces the construction as the verb of the clause without a change of meaning.

The use of this construction may modify the meaning of the clause; it affects the aspectual features of the verb which may be reflected in Czech translation equivalents. Furthermore, the construction allows for easier modification and quantification. The modifiers and quantifiers are usually translated as adverbials into Czech, but their position and integration may cause problems in translation.

Apart from analyzing the construction and its constituents, the aim is to provide linguistic analysis of 140 examples of the construction from English texts written by contemporary native speakers of English, as well as their Czech translation equivalents. The examples and their equivalents will be obtained using ParaConc, concordance software for multilingual parallel corpora. The examples will be classified and described, after which the equivalents will be briefly evaluated. The result of the thesis will be a description of authentic examples of the construction with a list of their translation equivalents.

2. Theoretical Background

Aside from giving an overview of terminology used for the analyzed construction, this chapter analyzes on the one hand the elements forming the construction, on the other hand it describes the construction as a whole. Due to the syntactic SVO pattern of the construction, special attention is paid to the verbal element and the object; the light verb is defined and contrasted to the lexical verb and the eventive object is contrasted to the direct and indirect object to clarify its special character.

2.1. Terminology

There is no simple generally acknowledged term for the construction concerned. Instead, there exist various different terms under which it is analyzed, and this may cause difficulties or confusion when it is searched in literature.

A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language [Randolph Quirk, et al., 1985; *CGEL* henceforth] terms the verb in this construction ‘a common verb of general meaning’ and does not analyze it in detail [*CGEL*: 750]. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* [Libuše Dušková, et al., 2006: 417; *MSA* henceforth] and Miroslav Renský [1964: 289] consider the verb a copula in a verbo-nominal predication. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* [Douglas Biber, et al., 2006; *LGSWE* henceforth] classifies the verb as a ‘semantically light verb’ [*LGSWE*: 128] and the *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* [Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum, et al., 2002; *CamGEL* henceforth] calls the verb simply a ‘light verb’ [*CamGEL*: 111].

The noun phrase occurring in combination with the light verb is generally regarded as an eventive object from the semantic perspective, or in Czech ‘událostní předmět’ [*MSA*: 426]. In other cases, it is called a ‘deverbal object’ [Teresa Moralejo Gárate, 2002: 299; “Composite predicates and Modification flexibility in Middle English”] or ‘abstract noun derived by means of conversion from V’ [Gabriele Stein, 1991: 2; “The Phrasal Verb Type ‘to have a look’ in Modern English”].

MSA consider the construction as a type of verbo-nominal predication with a copular verb complemented by an object and does not provide a specific term for the combination

of a semantically light verb and an eventive object [MSA: 417]. *LGSWE* classifies the construction as a subtype of ‘multi-word lexical verbs’, namely under the heading of ‘other multi-word constructions’ constituted by ‘verb + noun phrase,’ [LGSWE: 403] or as a ‘verbal idiom’ [LGSWE: 273]. Other terms include ‘the expanded predicate’ for the brevity and the ‘appropriateness’ of the term [John Algeo, 1995: 204; “Having a look at the expanded predicate”], or a ‘phrasal verb type “to have a look” [Stein: 2], or a ‘periphrastic construction with have,’ [Anna Wierzbicka, 1982: 755; “Why can you have a drink when you can’t *have an eat?”], or a ‘composite predicate’ [Gárate: 1].

In this thesis, we shall call the construction an ‘expanded predicate’ for the sake of brevity, its verbal component a ‘light verb’ for the same reason and the noun phrase shall be referred to as ‘an eventive object’ in accord with the semantic perspective.

2.2. Elements of the construction

2.2.1. The verb

The verb element is the most ‘central’ element of the sentence. After the verb there may be one or two objects, or a complement, which follows the object if one is present. The most peripheral element is the adverbial, which appears either initially or finally. ‘[The verb] is the most ‘central’ in that its position (i) is normally medial; (ii) it is normally obligatory; (iii) it cannot normally be moved to a different position in the clause; and (iv) it helps to determine what other elements must occur’ [CGEL: 50].

Semantically, there is a distinction ‘between dynamic (count) meanings and stative (noncount) meanings of verbs. It should be noted, though, that we talk of dynamic and stative meanings, rather than dynamic and stative verbs. This is because one verb may shift in meaning from one category to another,’ contrasting ‘the stative meaning of *have* [= ‘possess’] with a dynamic meaning of *have* [‘eat’]:

- (1) ?The chair has beautiful carved legs quite frequently.
- (2) We have dinner at Maxim's quite frequently.

Having carved legs is a state, while having dinner is an event’ [CGEL: 178].

The expanded predicate construction allows a dynamic expression of otherwise stative verb, which can be seen in the opposition of e.g. *look* – *have a look*.

‘One of the characteristics of dynamic verb senses is that they often [...] imply agentivity; i.e. they imply an active doer (initiator, performer) of the action concerned. Hence dynamic verb meanings can regularly combine with the imperative, but stative verb meanings cannot. [...] In some cases, the same verb can be either dynamic (referring to an event) or stative (referring to the state resulting from that event). Hence the virtual equivalence, in some contexts, of’

(3) *I've got the idea* and (4) *I get the idea*

(5) *I've forgotten* and (6) *I forget.*’ [CGEL: 178]

This influences the possibilities of formal tests to recognize the expanded predicate construction from a formally identical stative construction. The expanded predicate is a dynamic construction with an agentive initiator of the action and should therefore allow a paraphrase in contrast to formally identical stative construction, which will not allow a paraphrase.

2.2.1.1. Light verb

Despite all the different terms used for the verb as it occurs in the combination with an eventive object, all grammar books agree that a verb is ‘light’, or that it has ‘a general meaning,’ when ‘[its] contribution to the meaning of the predication is relatively little in comparison with that of their complements’ [CamGEL: 290]. The main formal change from its lexical meaning in one unit is the dissociation of meaning into two units [CamGEL: 111], the first unit being the verb which expresses the verbal categories and the second unit being the following noun onto which the semantic content is shifted from the verb [MSA: 408], more specifically the head of the noun phrase constituting the direct object [CamGEL: 290]. The lexical verbs occurring in constructions which are formed by several units from the syntactic perspective, yet form one unit from the semantic perspective, are frequently the most common lexical verbs, and are typically associated with physical movement or state: e.g.: *come, fall, get, give, go, keep, make, put, and take* [CGEL: 1150]. ‘Three verbs are particularly productive in combining with a following noun phrase to form relatively idiomatic expressions: *have, take, and make*’ [LGSWE: 1026].

2.2.1.2. Have and take

Have functions both as an auxiliary and as a main verb. ‘As a transitive main verb, *have* is as common as the most frequent lexical verbs in English. Across the four registers, *have* is

most common in conversation and least common in academic prose. Within academic prose, though, *have* is more common than any of the lexical verbs. [...] [T]he main verb *have* can be used with various meanings marking many different kinds of logical relations,' namely physical possession, family connection, food consumption, existential, linking a person to some abstract quality, linking an inanimate subject to some abstract quality, it may mark causation and it has a 'marginal semi-modal status in the expression *have to*' [LGSWE: 429]. The dynamic *have* is a lexical verb, 'stative *have* can behave as either a lexical verb or, in some varieties, an auxiliary,' which is reflected in the way negation is formed [CamGEL: 112].

'When used as a main verb with stative meaning, *have* shows syntactic variation in that it not only combines with do-support in forming constructions with an operator [...], but also acts as an operator itself. [...] In dynamic senses such as "receive", "take", "experience", and in idioms with an eventive object,' e.g. *have breakfast* = '*eat breakfast*', *have* (in both American English and British English) normally has *do*-support, and *have got* is not possible:

(7) A: Does she have coffee with her breakfast?

B : Yes, she does.

(8) A: Did you have any difficulty getting here?

B : No, I didn't.

(9) A : Did you have a good time in Japan?

B : Yes, we certainly did. [CGEL: 130-132]

Have is considered a light verb in cases when its possessive meaning is weakened to the degree that it forms one semantic unit with its object expressed by an action object and where the whole unit can be replaced by the verb from which the object is derived, e.g.

(10) *to have a look/to look*

(11) *to have a smoke/to smoke* [MSA: 417].

Furthermore, *have* in its light meaning in the expanded predicate occurs rarely in the present tense, instead '*have*-constructions tend to favour the imperative and the future tense' [Stein: 13].

The length of the definition of *take* in the *Longman Exams Dictionary* illustrates the general nature of the verb. Some of its meanings are defined as 'to move or go with someone or something from one place to another,' 'to remove something from a place,' 'to accept or choose something that is offered, suggested, or given to you,' 'to get hold of something in your hands,' etc. ["Take," *Longman Exams Dictionary*, English ed. 2006]. In its light meaning, *take* often alternates with *have*, in which case *have* is considered to be typical for British English and *take* typical for American English [MSA: 417-419]. Because of the overlap

between *have* and *take*, they are often considered together. ‘Light *take* is dynamic and normally agentive, whereas *have* has a somewhat wider range of use,’ e.g.

(12) *He took a decision to assert himself* (dynamic)

and

(13) *He has a need to assert himself* (stative).

In addition to that, ‘a number of nouns combining with *have* are also found with (ordinary) *give* with a causative sense, “cause to have, let have”:

(14) *He gave me a shave*. [CamGEL: 295]

Leaving aside regionally motivated examples, there are some cases where ‘*take* seems to be in opposition to *have*. When we say that someone is

(15) *taking a bite/sip*

instead of

(16) *having a bite/sip*

we are focusing more on the getting than on the having of it.[...] The meaning of *take* in the V+N frame can thus be linked to one of the senses of the main verb *take*. It is interesting to note in this respect that *take* occurs with the very group of deverbal conversion nouns that have both an abstract meaning (“instance, act of V-ing”) and a concrete one (“amount procured, taken by V-ing”).’ The semantic feature that seems to differentiate *take* from *have* here seems to be a “purposeful” or “purpose-directed” feature of the verb *take* [Stein: 18-19].

2.2.2. The object

The object is defined as a clause element most frequently realized by a noun or by another word class functioning as a syntactic noun which complements the verb or, in some cases, the adjective. Depending on the valency of the verb it can be either obligatory or optional in the particular clause. Formally, it is distinguished only in the case of personal pronouns, the interrogative and the relative *who* (*whom*). Otherwise, there is no formal difference between the form in the subject and the form in the object for all the other pronouns and all the nouns; the only distinguishing factor is the word order.

2.2.2.1. The direct object

The direct object is then determined by its position after the verb. The only case when this is not so is in the *wh*-word questions asking about the object, where the word order of the subject and object is reversed:

(17) *What did this complication cause?*

The syntactic functions of clause elements are determined by their position with respect to the verb. The clause element after the finite verb (auxiliary or modal) is the object, the clause element before the lexical verb is the subject.

The post-verbal position can also be occupied by an adverb and if the adverb is expressed by a noun or a prepositional phrase, there is no formal distinction from the object. Nevertheless, it is still possible to distinguish the two using a question test and the possibility of paraphrasing the sentence in the passive voice. The direct object can usually become the subject of a passive construction and we form a question with *what*, whereas the sentence with an adverb cannot form a passive construction and we use *when*, *where*, *why*, *how* etc. when forming a question. However, sometimes even these two tests fail, evidence that there is no clear-cut line between an object and an adverb [MSA: 423-430].

2.2.2.2. The indirect object

The indirect object expresses the second participant, usually an animate one, besides the direct object. Formally, it is distinguished by its position before the direct object, the only exception being the case when both the direct and the indirect object in the clause are expressed by a pronoun, in which case the indirect object stands after the direct object. Usually, the indirect object alternates with the prepositional object introduced by *to* or *for* and it can become the subject of a passive construction. In contrast to the diverse semantics of the direct object, the indirect object has basically one semantic role: The indirect object expresses the real or intended recipient of the object of the verbal action. The most typical relation between a direct and an indirect object is possessive in the respect that the recipient has or does not have the object expressed by the direct object in its possession [MSA: 433-438].

From the semantics of the indirect object it follows that it can only be expressed by a noun or a pronoun. Despite the fact that it is always implied by the semantic structure of

the verb, it is not syntactically indispensable and most ditransitive verbs can be used without it. The presence of the direct object is more necessary in that by its omission the indirect object in the clause loses its role of a recipient and becomes the direct object, *cf.*

(18) *I found her a corner seat* – (19) *I found her*,

although in some cases this does not hold true and the indirect object retains its role of a recipient, e.g.

(20) *They paid him twenty pounds* - (21) *they paid him*.

In some cases the position of the indirect object can express a participant independent of the verb valency, which still participates in the action or is somehow interested in it. This free dative occurs in the cases when the semantic structure of verb in the clause does not require a recipient, e.g.

(22) *pick me a rose*.

This construction can be paraphrased by

(23) *he picked a rose for me*,

but the passive paraphrase is created as in the case of prepositional object [MSA: 433-438].

Furthermore, ‘the indirect object [which] normally takes the role of recipient, [...] occasionally takes an affected role with a few of the verbs that combine with an eventive object, e.g.’

(24) *She gave me a push*. ['She pushed me.']

(25) *I gave Helen a nudge*. ['I nudged Helen.']

(26) *We gave the baby a bath*. ['We bathed the baby.']

(27) *I should give the car a wash*. ['I should wash the car.']

(28) *Give the car a push*. ['Push the car.']

(29) *Judith paid me a visit*. ['Judith visited me.']

(30) *Derek owes us a treat*. ['It's Derek's turn to treat us.'] [CGEL: 753.]

In addition to that, '[t]he indirect object has the same role as the affected direct object in the paraphrases. Unlike the recipient indirect object, the affected indirect object is not normally paraphrasable by a prepositional phrase:

(25) *I gave Helen a nudge*.

(31) *I gave a nudge to Helen*.’ [CGEL: 753]

This is because ‘this type of construction is intended to focus on the nominal equivalent of the verb (*nudge* in this example) and therefore the direct object should receive end-focus’ [CGEL: 753]. Furthermore, metaphorical uses of other verbs should be included ‘where paraphrases indicate that the indirect object has an affected role:

(32) *I taught him a lesson* [roughly 'I disciplined him.'],’

and where '[t]he indirect object has the role of 'comitative' ['together with'] or perhaps 'opposition':

(33) I played *Sam* a game of chess. ['I played a game of chess with/against Sam.'] [CGEL: 753].

2.2.2.3. The eventive object

The eventive object is defined as 'a deverbal noun preceded by a common verb of general meaning, such as *do, give, have, make, take*, [which] is semantically an extension of the verb and bears the major part of the meaning, e.g.

(34) They *are arguing*. [verb only]

(35) They *are having an argument*. [verb + eventive object]' [CGEL: 750].

Therefore, syntactically it occupies the place of the direct object. Semantically, the eventive object may be related to the cognate object 'in that it substitutes for the major lexical meaning of the verb whereas the cognate object repeats the lexical meaning. Compare:

(36) They fought *for a long time*. [verb + adverbial]

(37) They fought *a long fight*. [verb + cognate object]

(38) They *had a long fight*. [verb + eventive object]' [CGEL: 751].

MSA sees the expanded predicate constructions concerned as being on the borderline between the cognate and the resultant objects in that the existence of the object is usually dependent on the duration of the verbal action, e.g.

(39) They *had a stroll in the woods* [MSA: 426].

Since some verbal activity is predicated of the subject, the deverbal noun constituting the eventive object is abstract [Stein: 7]. Furthermore, the eventive object in most cases is an object only syntactically because it forms one semantic unit with the verb, where the verb expresses the grammatical categories and the object is the lexical and semantic unit of the construction. The semantic intransitivity of the action can be proved by the synonymy of the paraphrase with an intransitive verb:

(40) They *strolled in the woods* [MSA: 426].

In some cases, the nouns constituting the eventive object are not derived from verbs,

for example there is no verb *effort*, although *an effort* is eventive in

(41) *I'm making an effort*

and whereas *work* in

(42) *He did some work*

is deverbal, there is no related verb for *homework* in

(43) *He did some homework;*

other examples: *have a game*, *have a haircut*, *make fun (of)*, *make peace (with)*, cf: *make war (on)*. In some instances, the verb is not normally used intransitively:

(44) *I made a mistake/an attempt/a correction.*

In other instances, the combination clearly does not have the same meaning as the verb alone, e.g.: *make love (to)*, *take trouble (over)*, *make a difference*. In a few instances, the combination has (or may have) a passive meaning, particularly with *have*:

(45) *I had a fright.* ['*I was frightened.*']

(46) *The baby's having a bath.* ['*The baby is being bathed.*']

(47) *I'll have a shampoo, if I may.* ['*I want my hair to be shampooed.*']

(48) *He took offence at my remarks.* ['*He was offended by my remarks.*']

[CGEL: 751]

MSA adds that in some cases the noun in this type of construction is not even a syntactic noun, e.g. in the case of

(49) *take place.*

This construction is classified as a multiple word intransitive verb because neither the paraphrase by a passive construction is possible, nor can we form a question asking *what*. In addition, *place* in this case cannot even form a plural, it cannot be modified and the whole construction cannot be paraphrased by the verb *place*, since it would give the construction a completely different meaning [MSA: 426].

In most cases, the eventive object is accompanied by an agentive subject, although in some cases the subject is recipient or experiencer:

(50) *Bill got a view of the candidate,*

(51) *I had a wonderful dream,*

(52) *Sally took an instant dislike to the new tenant.*

Others are affected:

(53) *Saul took a fall,*

(54) *The team has taken a beating,*

(55) *At the sudden noise Bob gave a jump.* [...]

Have can more easily take an affected subject than *take*:

(56) *The baby's having a bath* (also in AmE),

generally not

(57) ?**The baby's taking a bath*' [CGEL: 752].

2.2.3. The expanded predicate construction

‘The expanded predicate is an idiomatic verb-object construction in which the verb [...] is semantically general and the object semantically specific[.] Such verb-object combinations are the semantic equivalents of verbs to which the noun objects are morphologically related’ [Algeo: 204].

It is important to realize that ‘[t]he actual realizations of many structural patterns are scalar. That is, there are many instances that clearly show the pattern and are in common use. Yet there are also instances which are new realizations and where native speakers will vary as to acceptability judgments’ [Stein: 10]. The constructions with *have/take* followed by a noun phrase form ‘relatively idiomatic expressions [...]’. The resultant expressions form a cline of idiomaticity. At one extreme there are clearly idiomatic expressions, such as *have a look, make a killing, and take time*,’ e.g.

(58) ‘*Michael can I have a look please.*’

[LGSWE: 1026-1027]. ‘At the other extreme, there are expressions that retain the core meaning of these verbs,’ e.g.

(59) ‘*Well, we have an extra one*’ [LGSWE: 1027].

In between are a number of relatively idiomatic expressions, such as *have a chance, have a bath* [...]. In these expressions, the meanings of individual words are retained to some extent, but the entire expression also takes on a more idiomatic meaning’ [LGSWE: 1027].

In addition to that, when trying ‘to establish the semantic conditions for a structural pattern, one will always discover gaps in the realization of the structural possibilities. Such apparent gaps may be accidental or systematic and as potential clues to usage restrictions they deserve special attention. A well-known example for an accidental gap from English word-formation is the non-existent noun **stealer*. There is no –er derivative from the verb *to steal* presumably because the place is already occupied by the noun *thief*. In our case, we might similarly argue that the construction

(60) **to have a play*

does not occur perhaps because the noun *play* is lexicalized as “a piece of writing to be performed” and in the sense of “activity of playing” *game* has taken its place’ [Stein: 11-12].

2.2.3.1. Formal features

Within the construction, there are ‘several subvarieties and related constructions.’ The first group constitutes the ‘simplest and purest form, [where] the eventive noun is a formally unaltered functional shift of the verb:

(61) *try* = *have a try* (in which the noun is historically derived from the verb) or

(62) *party* = *have a party* (in which the verb is derived from the noun).’

There may be a difference between the pair in ‘prosodic phonemes’ and ‘segmental phonemes,’ e.g. in

(63) *protest* /prəˈtest/ = *make a protest* /ˈprəʊtest/.

In other cases, ‘affixation may play part:

(64) *compare* = *make a comparison*.’

Besides formal variation, there may be ‘a flaw in correspondence between the expanded predicate and a corresponding simple verb. Some have no parallel single-word verb in ordinary present day use:

(65) *do homework*

[...], others have a noncognate single-word equivalent,’ e.g.

(66) *take cover* = *hide*.

In other cases, ‘the eventive noun is morphologically related to a simple verb, but the expanded predicate differs semantically from that verb:

(67) *make love (to/with)* ≠ *to love* [...],

or the expanded predicate may correspond to a passive rather than an active simple verb:

(68) *have a bath (the baby will...)* = *be bathed*’ [Algeo: 205-206].

A core subset of the construction ‘consists of expressions that satisfy the following conditions:

1. [T]he verb of the expanded predicate is one of the four most frequent semantically general verbs: *give*, *have*, *make*, *take*. [...]

2. The eventive object is morphologically identical with a simple verb to which it is semantically related. This condition eliminates correspondences of the type *take account of* = *allow for*, in which there is no morphological similarity, as well as *do an investigation* = *investigate*, in which there is morphological relation but not identity, and *have a bash at* = *try* = but ≠ *bash* “strike, attack”, in which there is morphological identity but not semantic relationship. [...]

3. The eventive object is an indefinite noun. This condition eliminates constructions like *I'll do the answering*. [...] It also eliminates constructions like *take one's pick*, although it allows the marginal *take a pick*.

4. Constructions that meet some but not all of the foregoing requirements are pseudo expanded predicates. They are particularly those whose object are not eventive or does not correspond to a semantically specific verb' [Algeo: 207-208].

Furthermore, we can speak about an expanded predicate construction only when there is the possibility of paraphrasing the construction with an eventive object by a verbal construction, in which the verb is derived from the object of the expanded predicate construction, e.g.

(69) *to have a wash* – (70) *to wash*,

(71) *to make a start* - (72) *start*.

If there is no appropriate verb, the construction is considered to be a nominal expression on the lexical level as opposed to a phenomenon of the syntactical level, e.g.

(73) *to take aim* with (74) *to take place*,

where the paraphrase with *to place* has a different meaning. In addition to that, cases with metaphoric meaning should be excluded as well, e.g.

(75) *give a hand/to help*,

because *hand* has a different meaning from (75). [MSA: 419-420].

In addition to condition number two, Stein considers the issue whether 'the existence of a particular deverbal conversion noun in English predetermines the occurrence of a V+N frame or whether the frame as such may generate deverbal conversion nouns that occur in this frame only.' Based on her research, 'there are no such deverbal conversion nouns that are restricted to the V+N frame. Since there is no deverbal conversion noun from the verb *to observe*, for instance, but only the suffixal derivative *observation*, there is no verbal structure of the frame

(76) **to have/*to take/*to make an observe*.

The non-occurrence of the verbal structure (76) is thus not linked to the selection difficulty of the "empty verb"[.] The formation of deverbal conversion nouns is bound by formal constraints, namely that '[d]isyllabic and trisyllabic verbs derived from French and Latin form the corresponding abstract action nouns by means of a suffix, not by means of a zero-morpheme.' Furthermore, there is a tendency not to form zero-derived deverbal nouns from derived verbs, either suffixal or zero-derived. In addition to that, phrasal verbs in the expanded predicate are extremely rare [Stein: 7-8].

Adding to condition number three, the indefinite article of the eventive object alternates 'with its counterparts in the system, as the zero article with uncountables and in the plural,

the numeral in the plural, or with other determination (*some, any*, possessive pronoun, negation, exceptionally the definite article). The singularizing meaning of the indefinite article (or the repetitive meaning of some its alternants) does indeed signify, in connection with the character of the empty verb, the aspectual attribute of perfectivity as against the aspectually unmarked verb. There are, however, means of cancelling this attribute: the progressive form of the empty verb [...], some lexical temporal data, context, or the character of the phrase.' The indefinite article also has a rhematizing function in that it can 'signal the nucleus of the utterance,' 'either in cooperation with the place of its substantive in the sentence or – under certain conditions – in itself' [Renský: 295].

Gárate also notes that already in the period of Middle English the expanded predicates 'permitt[ed] a wide array of modification, complementation and determination possibilities through many different structural devices, such as closed-class items, clauses, prepositional phrases, and adjectival phrases.' In addition to that, her study proves that the deverbal nouns occurring in the expanded predicate 'are indeed quite frequently modified by either one or a combination of several such modification possibilities,' and '[w]ith regard to the various forms of modification, different interrelations have been revealed operating among them. For instance, postponed modifiers favour the presence of the definite article and complemented [expanded predicates], which gradually increase throughout the period, are less likely to be modified than [expanded predicates] with no complement' [Garate: 12].

'The use of a light verb and noun tends to yield a significant increase in syntactic versatility over that of the associated verb construction.' It also 'allows for dependents to be added to the noun, allowing a considerably greater range of elaboration by modifiers and determiners,' e.g.

(77) *She gave him an unusually passionate kiss.*

(78) *We took a well-earned rest.*

(79) *She had an enduring influence on him.*

In (77), the construction with the eventive object is 'less awkward than *She kissed him unusually passionately*,' and '*well-earned* and *enduring* [...] have no close adverbial counterparts that could be used with the associated verbs [CamGEL: 291]. Thus, the construction permits modification which would not possible in the verb construction or it would have a different meaning, e.g.

(80) *I had a good look at him*

in contrast to

(81) **I looked at him well* [MSA: 417].

Furthermore, ‘with a multiple qualification, the V-N transformation allows its purposeful distribution and gradation; the most prominent place is thus occupied by the qualifier that forms a certain unit with the rheme, often its nucleus proper:

(82) **John laughed shortly, royally, scornfully* ->

(83) *John gave a short laugh of royal scorn*’ [Renský: 296].

The dependents also allow for quantification, as in:

(84) *I’ve already had two showers today.*

(85) *She made three very astute comments on his suggestion.*

(86) *He gave a scream.*

The paraphrase for (84) *I’ve already showered twice today* is equivalent to its eventive object construction paraphrase, but the paraphrase does not work for the second example. In (85) *She commented three times very astutely on his suggestion* quantifies the event, whereas *made three very astute comments* quantifies the product of the event. ‘The most usual determiner with light verbs is the indefinite article, [which] too introduces quantification, which may make the meaning somewhat different from that of the associated verb construction’ [CamGEL: 291]. Semantically, the difference lies in the fact that the construction with the eventive singles out an event. Further semantic differences will be clear from looking at the following examples:

(87) *He drank my milk.*

(88) *He had a drink of my milk.*

(89) *He walked in/to the park.*

(90) *He had a walk in/*to the park.*

(91) *He lay down.*

(92) *He had a lie down.*

(93) *He pitied them.*

(94) *He had/took pity on them.*

(87) implies ‘that he drank it all, whereas in (88) he drank only part of it.’ In (89) and (90), ‘both allow in the park as a location adjunct, but only *he walked* allows to the park as goal,’ *he had a walk* presents the action as ‘a recreational [activity].’ Similarly, (92) is more specific, ‘it is used when the purpose of *lying down* is to rest - not, for example, to undergo a medical examination.’ In (93) and (94) the difference lies in the dynamic or stative presentation of the construction [CamGEL: 292].

In cases where ‘there are elements following the noun [...], there is some indeterminacy as to whether they are complements of the noun itself or of the light verb,’ as in

(95) *He gave a demonstration of this technique to the postgraduates.*

(96) *He gave the postgraduates a demonstration of this technique.*

From the semantic perspective, it makes no difference, ‘because light *give* contributes so little meaning; and syntactically there is little evidence to resolve the issue.’ Generally, ‘the complements are the same as those of the noun when it is used independently of the light verb.’ However, ‘properties of the light verb in its ordinary use may affect the complementation. In particular, *give*, *make*, and *do* are ditransitive verbs, and under certain conditions take an indirect object in their light use too, whereas nouns [...] do not take any objects as complement. In addition to that, sometimes ‘we find [prepositional phrases] which could not occur with the noun independently of the light verb,’ as in

(97) *His blame for it on Kim is unfair.

(98) He put/laid the blame for it on Kim.

(99) He blamed it on Kim. [*CamGEL*: 292]

The use of the expanded predicate can influence also the semantics of an imperative construction with a simple verb, e.g.

(100) *Run!* and (110) *Have a run!*

The two examples have a different illocutionary force. The bare imperative form ‘is an acceptable and adequate order in what is assumed to be an emergency where immediate action is necessary. [...] If there is no such situation, the imperative form on its own is a rather rude or impatient order. [...]’ The expanded predicate ‘is a suggestion that recalls other have-constructions in which *have* expresses an offer.’ In addition to that, the bare imperative form is intensified by an adverbial, while the expanded predicates are ‘made more persuasive or insistent by adding *do*: *Do have a rest (before you go to the meeting).*’ On the whole, ‘[t]he less direct expression, the longer have-construction is the politer form,’ suggestions expressed by the expanded predicate express ‘personal courtesy, personal attention and care for another person’ [Stein: 21-22].

The fact that expanded predicate construction singles out a single event is reflected in ‘the perfective aspect,’ which is not a grammatical category in English’ [Renský: 295]. However, it is especially important for the Czech translation. In Czech, the construction is translated as a verbal construction, the modification if present is a modification by an adverb and the difference in aspect is reflected in the morphological structure of the verb, e.g. in the prefix; for instance:

(101) *Will you have a drink with me? Napiješ se se mnou?*

The cases where the translation is also a verbo-nominal construction are rare, but they exist, e.g.

(102) *to have an itch for something* – *mít na něco zálsk.*

Some of these constructions are often on the boundary with fixed phrases [MSA: 417-419].

2.2.3.2. Motivation of the expanded predicate

In some cases the construction is motivated syntactically in that the SV construction is not even possible because the verb cannot be used intransitively, e.g.

(103) *they made an attempt.*

In addition to that, the expanded predicate construction explicitly selects one event as opposed to an undivided process denoted by the verb itself, e.g.

(104) *she gave a yell*

in contrast to the neutral

(105) *she yelled.*

This serves as a means of expressing aspect of the verb [MSA: 420], which is particularly important in translation, especially into Czech, a language that uses aspect as one of the grammatical categories of the verb [MSA: 420].

The expanded predicate construction also ‘provides greater weight than the corresponding SV type, especially if there are no optional adverbials, and is often preferred to the SV construction in informal English’ [CGEL: 751]. The fact that it is preferred over the SV type is given by ‘[t]he very nature of theme and focus [...], [which] leads to the expectation that the thematic item (typically the subject) will be shorter than the focal item (typically a part of the predicate). Given, moreover, that the V element is not normally expected to carry the maximum communicative dynamism in a sentence [...], we develop the expectation that V will be at a transition point between a thematic low communicative dynamism and a focal high,’ e.g.

(106) *Jill will decide next WEEK.*

‘All this has the effect of making the simplest realization of the SV clause type sound oddly incomplete,’ e.g.

(107) *Mary SANG.*

‘In consequence, this type of SV realization is rather rare and it would be more usual to find an optional predication adjunct,’ e.g.

(108) *Mary sang for hours.* ‘At the very least, we would make intransitive verbs bipartite, an auxiliary serving as a transition between theme and focus:

(109) *Mary was SINGING.*

[...] Such rephrasing is obviously context-dependent; it is not often, for example, that a verb phrase might equally well be progressive or nonprogressive' [CGEL: 1401-1402].

Therefore, dissociating the predicate into a multi-word structure is '[o]ne of the most generally serviceable [means] [...] to replace the intransitive verb by a transitive one of very general meaning, taking as its eventive object a nominalization of the intransitive item. The general verbs *do*, *make*, *give*, *have*, *take* are widely used in this construction, though the choice is strictly limited in any individual case:

(110) **She took a shriek.*

(111) **She did a shriek.*

unless the latter is in the sense '*She acted/performed a shriek*', as on the request of the producer)' [CGEL: 1401-1402].

In addition to that, the construction puts 'focal emphasis on the activity rather than on a human participant' and therefore, 'it may be preferable not to use the eventive object construction at all when it is a human participant that is needed in end-focus' [CGEL: 1396]. Modifying the eventive object achieves a different linear modification which can furthermore be used for a shift in the topic-focus perspective [MSA: 420].

2.2.3.3. Use of have and take with respect to registers and varieties of English

'Although earlier studies have claimed that formulaic language is dominant in conversation, idiomatic phrases with the verbs *have*, *make*, and *take care* by far more common in the written registers' [LGSWE: 1028]. 'The verbo-nominal phrases have a common and more general function: they isolate the notional nucleus of verbal predication from its predicational categories (and from its complementation) and single it out as a rheme of the utterance. [...] The necessity of isolating some relations usually expressed in a complex way is characteristic of the scientific style.' Scientific texts have 'the same overall frequency of verbo-nominal phrases as in literary style [...] and the same frequency of basic V-N types,' the expanded predicate constituting seventy percent. In the scientific style, however, the expanded predicate loses its 'primary specific function of standing for the perfective aspect. Their lexical content is equally different; phrases with words of domestic origin, predominant in both the colloquial style, are far outnumbered by phrases like: draw conclusions, give consideration [...], etc.' 'The majority of the V-N phrases in scientific style' fulfil 'their common function in the contextual

organization rather than their specific functions. The semantic content is also different due to the high density of abstract thought in scientific style [Renský: 297].

Several of the constructions 'are notably common only in news reportage and/or academic prose,' e.g. *take place, take part, take advantage, take action* [LGSWE: 1028]. '[T]wo expressions formed with *take* are common in fiction but not the expository registers': *take a look, take care*. 'Common phrases formed with *have* tend to be more colloquial. The phrase *have time* (often in a negative context) is found in all four registers, although it is less common in news and academic prose. [...] *Have a look* is found commonly in conversation and fiction,' being particularly common in British English conversation. 'The expressions *have a look* and *take a look* are used with nearly equivalent meaning, but they have very different distributions. Both expressions occur with moderate frequencies in fiction[]' The difference is that in conversation, the two variants are distributed differently with respect to variants, *have a look* being the British English preferred variant, appearing about two hundred times per million words, and *take a look* being the choice American English, occurring about twenty times per million words. 'The phrase *have no idea* is used commonly in fiction and occasionally in news with colloquial, emphatic overtones[] [...] Finally, the expression *to have some/little effect* is used commonly in written exposition to describe the influence of various factors' [LGSWE: 1028-1029].

The differences between the varieties 'are often statistical rather than categorical. That is, both options are used in both varieties, but with different probabilities of occurrence,' the extreme and relatively rare case being that one instance is found in a variety and not at all in the other. In addition to that, the expression may be found in both varieties, 'but more frequently [...] in the variety named and with limitations on its occurrence [...] in the other. [...] The label 'British' or 'American' [...] is rather a signal of some type of unequal distribution of the item between the two varieties' [Algeo: 209].

2.2.4. Formal tests and conditions determining the expanded predicate

On the basis of all the information given in the theoretical introduction, the conditions and the tests when differentiating the expanded predicate constructions from pseudo expanded predicates and other constructions are:

1. The verb of the construction, *have* or *take*, must be used in its 'light' meaning.
2. The eventive object is morphologically identical with the simple verb to which it is semantically related.

3. The eventive object will most typically have an indefinite article or the indefinite article will alternate with its counterparts in the system.
4. The object of the expanded predicate must work in a paraphrase as the verb of the clause. *To give a push- to push*
5. If such a paraphrase is possible, there must not occur a change of meaning. *To take part ≠ to part*
6. The meaning of the construction cannot be metaphorical, since the paraphrase would cause a change of meaning. *Give a hand ≠ hand*
7. The expanded predicate construction must allow modification, coordination, complementation, quantification or determination of the eventive object.
8. In the expanded predicate with *have*, *have got* must not be able to paraphrase *have*.
9. The formal construction SVOiOd does not allow for a paraphrase into SVOdOprep. *He gave her a push. *He gave a push to her.*
10. The imperative is intensified by “do” as opposed to intensification by an adverbial.

3. Material and Method

3.1. Material

To obtain a sufficient number of examples of the expanded predicate construction, the following three novels were used. Two of the three novels were written by British authors: J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, translated into Czech by Vladimír Medek, and *The Holy Thief* by the novelist Ellis Peters, translated into Czech by Stanislava Pošustová. The third novel used for the excerption was *Life before Man* written by the Canadian author Margaret Atwood, translated in Czech by Viktor Janiš.

The theoretical background was drawn from comprehensive grammar books for more general information on the topic, and from several studies on the topic in a more detailed perspective. The grammar book that provided the principal amount of information was *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* by Randolph Quirk et al. (1985), which was complemented by information from *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* by the authors Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum et al. (2002) and *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* by Douglas Biber et al. (1999). Since the thesis partly relies on a contrastive approach concerning the differences between Czech and English, *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* by Libuše Dušková, et al. was crucial in this respect. The studies employed for more specific information about the construction were: "Having a look at the expanded predicate" by John Algeo; "The Phrasal Verb Type 'to have a look' in Modern English" by Gabriele Stein; "English Verbo-nominal phrases: some structural and stylistic aspects" by Miroslav Renský; "Why can you have a drink when you can't *have an eat?" by Anna Wierzbicka; "Composite predicates and Modification flexibility in Middle English" by Teresa Moralejo Gárate. Finally, to clarify the exact meanings in which the two general verbs *have* and *take* appear, *Longman Exams Dictionary* was employed.

3.2. Method

After providing the theoretical survey on the topic discussed, the second part of the thesis is based on the description of authentic instances of the construction under discussion, and a contrastive linguistic approach between Czech and English using parallel corpora software ParaConc to extract up to 150 empirical examples.

3.2.1. Paraconc

ParaConc is parallel concordance software for multilingual parallel corpora, which allows the study of corpora in any language. It is user-friendly software which allows detailed investigation of, in this case, the original English text and its Czech translation equivalent in a quite intuitive manner, providing sufficient possibilities as far as search options or secondary statistical data are concerned. The investigated expressions may be sorted in different ways and the context in which they appear is also available.

3.2.2. Excerption of the examples

The analytic part of this thesis is based on 140 examples of the expanded predicate construction and their translation equivalents in Czech. These were searched for in the novels listed in chapter 3.1., using ParaConc.

The entire texts of the novels had to be used to obtain the final number of 140 examples. Two factors complicated the search: on the one hand it was the fact that this thesis focuses on two verbs, *have* and *take*, and on the other hand the fact that the expanded predicate construction is bipartite and is not limited with respect to verbal categories, most importantly tense and person. Therefore, advanced search had to be employed, using the ‘regular expression’ function. Two different searches for the two respective verbs were applied, using the following pattern to cover all the verb forms the verbs may appear in:

(have) | (has) | (had) | (having)
(take) | (takes) | (took) | (taken) | (taking)

For the purpose of lucidity, the search was applied for the three novels respectively, not at once, resulting in two tablets for each of the three novels. The search could have been simplified by adding the indefinite articles ‘*a*’ and ‘*an*’ after the verb forms, which would have

effectively eliminated a large number of occurrences with the verbs *have* and *take* followed by any other part of speech other than a noun. On the other hand, it would also have eliminated all occurrences with uncountable nouns which would have negatively influenced the search results. Therefore, the search was conducted in the suggested manner, which consequently meant that a large part of the resulting list was constituted by compound verb forms. The selection of relevant examples had to be done manually to retain only the occurrences of the type *have* or *take* followed by a noun phrase. However, this also did not produce the final number of the occurrences of the expanded predicate, which is given by the general nature of the verbs *have* and *take*. To discern and select only the cases of the construction concerned, the formal tests listed in Section 2.4 were used, which resulted in the final list of examples provided in the Appendix.

A statistical survey providing the quantitative information is shown in Table 1 which presents the total word count of each novel and the occurrence of the two verbs in the expanded predicate construction separately in absolute numbers, and their frequency per 1000 words, while the column total sums up the results of all the novels together. Table 1 suggests that there were fifty occurrences of *have* and ninety occurrences of *take* occurring in the expanded predicate in total, which represent the frequency 0.54 per 1000 words of the total word count of the three novels.

Table 1

	HT			LM			PS			Total			
	total word count	abs	Freq. per 1000	total word count	abs	Freq. per 1000	total word count	abs	Freq. per 1000	total word count	abs	Frequency per 1000 of total word count	% of absolute occurrence
<i>have</i>	83,337	17	0.2	98,796	27	0.3	78,517	6	0.1	260,650	50	0.19	35,71
<i>take</i>		34	0.4		29	0.3		27	0.3		90	0.35	64,29
total	-	51	0.6	-	56	0.6	-	33	0.4	-	140	0.54	100

After obtaining the final list of occurrences, each example was assigned a code to allow for its easy identification and reference in the analytic chapter. This code consists of three pieces of information:

- The first letter suggests the general verb concerned; h standing for *have*, t standing for *take*.
- The two letter code in capital letters suggests the title of the novel from which the example is extracted:
 - LM stands for *Life before Man*

- HP stands for *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*
 - HT stands for examples from *Holy Thief*
- The number standing at the end of the code suggests the order of the examples in the given text.

An example of the code would be tLM10, meaning that it is the tenth sentence with the verb *take* in the expanded predicate construction from the novel *Life before Man*.

The final step in the excerption was to divide all the occurrences of the studied construction into two final lists. The two lists comprise all the examples of the verbs *have* and *take* respectively from all three novels, which enables an easier description of the material.

4. Analysis

This chapter provides with the analysis of the compiled examples from the three novels. It deals primarily with the analysis of the English examples and only secondarily with the Czech translation equivalents. As has been suggested, the criteria for identification of an eventive object construction were established in Section 2.4. The basis on which the examples were considered, however, proved relatively difficult to apply and, consequently, various subgroups had to be established. These are analysed in detail in Section 4.1 Syntactic Types. This analysis does not comprise only the examples which represent the central type of the construction, but shows that the eventive-object construction forms a cline where separate groups satisfy the formal criteria to a varying degree. Therefore, the most important and difficult task of the analysis was establishing the degree to which the occurrence is an example of the expanded predicate and in which aspects it is different.

The second part of the analysis, Section 4.2. Determination and Modification, describes the examples with respect to the presence or absence of modification and determination in the object noun phrase. It will be seen that one of the interesting features in this construction is the use of determiners and modifiers. Both these features have a bearing on the syntactic character of the construction, and also on the Czech translation equivalents, which will be briefly assessed in the last part of the chapter.

4.1. Syntactic Types

This chapter deals with the analysis of the examples based on the formal criteria specified in Section 2.4. The examples were classified into groups depending on the degree to which they satisfy the formal conditions, the central criterion being the possibility to paraphrase the eventive object as the verb. The most difficult task was to classify the examples as to the degree to which they deviate from the prototypic examples of the expanded predicate and to determine the difference in their semantic features. The examples are dealt with below in separate subsections for *have* and *take* to allow easier description of differences among the examples.

4.1.1. Have

The fifty examples with the light verb *have* have been classified into ten groups, the largest of them comprising the examples which satisfy the formal conditions of Section 2.4 in full. These represent core examples of the expanded predicate construction and form **Group A**. The other groups are small in the count of examples, ranging from two up to six and thus might be considered as individual examples specific in their meaning rather than groups.

The nouns found in **Group A** which take the position of the eventive object have been listed in Table 2 in the alphabetical order, the number of the most frequent ones being in bold.

Table 2

HAVE Group 1	HT	LM	PS	Total
breakfast			1	1
desire		1		1
distrust		1		1
drink			1	1
fear	1	1		2
fight	1			1
hate	1			1
look		1	1	2
love	1			1
lunch		5		5
pity	1			1
rest	1			1
trust	1			1
wish	2			2
Total	9	9	3	21

From Table 2, it is apparent that the most frequent nouns are: *lunch* (5), *fear* (2) and *look* (2). Taking into account also the occurrence of *breakfast* and *drink*, we may say that the nouns of consumption seem to take the position of the eventive object most frequently, pointing at a high degree of lexicalization and their character of multiword verbs.

A central example fulfilling all the formal conditions is e.g.

(1) *He went to have a look.* (hPS04)

Although it has been mentioned that this group is the most satisfying in terms of conditions, it is not homogenous. There are also certain differences among the examples, which will be apparent from contrasting (1) with (2):

(2) *[T]he toys he makes have this blank look, as if they can't see him[.]* (hLM19)

points out on the one hand the difficulty of classifying the examples purely on the formal level, and on the other hand shows that there are differences in meaning among occurrences of the same deverbal noun. In this case the example (2) is exceptional in that there is the demonstrative pronoun *this* in non-generic definite cataphoric type of reference, specified by and occurring due to the following *as if they can't see him*. Moreover, the eventive nature of this case is supported by the Czech translation equivalent:

(3) *Poslední dobou ale hračky z jeho dílny vypadají čím dál víc takhle bezvýrazně, jako kdyby ho neviděly.*

This example proves that employing only the formal tests is insufficient in that employing only the formal tests without paying respect to the context and semantics of each example would not classify the example correctly. From the semantic perspective the example belongs to **Group A** despite the definite cataphoric reference.

Another interesting contrast is between the examples (4) and (5):

(4) *Maybe we can have lunch sometime.* (hLM11)

(5) *Then they will have a lunch of creamed salmon on toast, with eggs grated on top[.]* (hLM07)

The first example shows the potential of the expanded predicate construction to express intransitive verb meanings transitively in the bipartite construction. It may be paraphrased by:

(6) *Maybe we can lunch sometime.*

The article is missing because the construction *have lunch* seems to be lexicalized in this case and may be viewed as a multi-word verb construction since it seems not to allow any determiner or modifier, as opposed to (5), where the article is present and expresses the indefinite specific reference, with the noun postmodified by *of* construction.

Example (5) also points to another variant feature of the construction. When comparing the expanded predicate construction and its paraphrase with the eventive object as the verb in the clause, there is a formal change in the means connecting dependent clause elements to the verb. In (5), the *of*-postmodification of the eventive object would change into a prepositional object:

(7) *Then they will lunch on creamed salmon on toast, with eggs grated on top.*

In a different example

(8) *If she had no love for him, she had no hate, either[.]* (hHT05)

the paraphrase would be constructed with a direct object:

(9) *If she didn't love him, she didn't hate him, either.*

However, there are also cases in which the paraphrase would be constructed using the same formal means, e.g.

(10) *Harry and Dudley promptly had a furious but silent fight over who would listen at the keyhole.* (hPS05)

There is yet another interesting example in the **Group A**:

(11) *[H]e would have no rest nor allow any to his superiors, while she was lost to him.* (hHT06)

As all the formal conditions are satisfied in this case, it is not interesting with respect to its form. What is notable is the use of the proform of the existential quantifier *any* which replaces the eventive object in the next clause. The replacement of the proform strengthens the object-like character of the eventive object *rest* in this case, although the semantics of this verbo-nominal phrase and the formal possibilities of the construction support the classification into the group of core examples of the expanded predicate.

Group B consists of two examples, (12) and (13):

(12) *They sit at a card table, the same card table on which they eat meals when they eat together, beside their picture window, which has a breathtaking view of the picture window in the apartment building opposite theirs.* (hLM06)

(13) *A little mischief in it, Hugh judged, content to be an onlooker and have the best view of the game, but no malice.* (hHT11)

These examples represent an interesting contrast which is dealt with in section The Verb 2.2.1. Both examples combine the verb *to have* with the object *a view*, but in only one case the central criterion is satisfied, allowing a paraphrase of the expanded predicate by using the eventive object as the verb of the paraphrasing clause. The formal structure provides no clue, it is the same in both cases, but only the example (13) may be paraphrased since there is an agentive subject, resulting in:

(14) *A little mischief in it, Hugh judged, content to be an onlooker and to view the game from the best place, but no malice.*

Group C consists of three members, the position of the object taken by the items *interest* (2) and *puncture* (1). It presents the problem of the formal structure of the construction from a different perspective. Both of the words exist simultaneously as nouns and verbs, theoretically enabling the paraphrase. However, it is possible in neither case since the meaning of the paraphrase would have to be the adjective *interested* to make sense. The example:

(15) *Elizabeth, on the other hand, has no interest in watching any sort of news whatsoever.* (hHLM15)

has to be paraphrased to:

(16) *Elizabeth, on the other hand, is not interested in watching any sort of news.*

However, there is no formal difference in the construction to inform the speaker, he or she must learn the difference.

Group D comprises three items which are semantically very close to **Group A** of prototypical examples, but there is some morphological alternation in the verb equivalents to the object nouns which recalls the idea of gaps in the realization of structural possibilities and the notion of a cline of idiomaticity described in Section 2.3. The nouns comprising this group are: *use* (2), *belief* (1), *speech* (1).

In examples hHT14 and hHT15 it is only phonological:

(17) *[H]e had a very particular use for her...* (hHT14)

(18) *Surely you don't suppose they'd have any use for her...* (hHT15)

Use as a noun /ju:s/ changes the voicing of the final consonant into /ju:z / in the verb. The change in *belief* and *speech* is reflected not only in pronunciation, but also in spelling: *belief* /bə'li:f/, *believe* /bə'li:v/, *speech* /spi:tʃ/, *speak* /spi:k/. There is an interesting difference in meaning between (17) and (18) which is not reflected in the form of the English construction, but it is in the Czech translation equivalents: *use* in (17) is translated as *použití*, while (18) is translated as

(19) *Přece si nemyslíte, že by jim k něčemu byla[.]*

Comparing these, the shift in meaning in (18) seems more apparent. In Czech, (18) is more idiomatic than (17) which is semantically closer to the typical expanded predicate construction with its paraphrase possibilities. (17) may be paraphrased to

(20) *He could/wanted to use her in a very particular manner,* while (18)

from the semantic point of view should be paraphrased as

(21) *Surely you don't suppose she would be of any use for them,*

in other words:

(22) *There is no use for her,* or (23) *She is completely useless,*

as opposed to (17), where even the paraphrase seems to suggest that *she is useful*, at least in one way.

In **Group E** there are three occurrences of *need* in the construction which deviates from the central examples in that there is no determiner present in any of the occurrences, despite the fact that *need* as a noun is countable, which goes against the third condition set in Section 2.3.1. All three examples are also postmodified by an *of*-construction, e.g.

(24) *We have need of every son of the house[.]* (hHT03)

These examples may be contrasted with the examples with *lunch* from **Group A**, where the presence of a postmodifying construction prompted the use of the article. Moreover, the *Longman Exams Dictionary* lists examples of expanded predicate constructions, where there is a determiner and a modifier present. This sets the present examples further away from the typical expanded predicate construction. The use of the bipartite construction in these examples on the one hand shift the focal emphasis away from the subject and verb onto the object, and on the other hand the longer construction sounds more polite, recalling the notion that the less direct form, the more polite [Stein: 22].

Group F consists of examples with varying features, all of which seem to satisfy the formal conditions, but do not correspond semantically. The most frequent item is *sense* (3), *go* (1), *contact* (1), *edge* (1). The most prominent opposition is between the examples with *sense*: (25) versus (26) and (27).

(25) *She lets her eyes slide over the bowls, over their subtle colors, their slightly asymmetrical curves, wonderful to have that sense, where to be off balance.* (hLM17)

(26) *He thinks she has an offbeat sense of humor.* (hLM20)

(27) *If Harry hadn't known that the Dursleys had no sense of humor ...* (hPS07)

Although there is no formal indicator, the difference is apparent from looking at the Czech translation equivalents. In Czech, the translation equivalent for the *have* construction in (25) is the verb: *vědět*, while there is a verbo-nominal expression also in Czech for (26): *má nekonvenční smysl pro humor* and (27): *Kdyby Harry nevěděl, že nemají smysl pro humor*. This suggests the degree of dynamism of the examples: While (25) may be paraphrased into a construction with the syntactic object replacing the verb, this is not possible for the other two.

The example (28):

(28) *...he'd be able to watch what he wanted on television for a change and maybe even have a go on Dudley's computer.* (hPS02)

is interesting in that it satisfies all formal tests and is the most dynamic from the group, but it has been subsumed here because of its idiomatic nature. Compared to (28), the examples (29) and (30) are less dynamic, but they still do permit the paraphrase to a certain degree although with an impact on the meaning.

(29) *...animal life with which Auntie Muriel has ever had any contact.* (hLM09)

(30) *....with Auntie Muriel having a slight edge.* (hLM02)

Paraphrasing (29) would give rise to a different translation equivalent in Czech, from *setkat se* to *kontaktovat*, and in English this would imply a much higher dynamism of the action and a stronger agentivity of the subject. Paraphrasing (30) would have the same consequences in the Czech translation equivalent as in the case of (29), but the English sentence would moreover lose the meaning of the implied result of an action.

The two examples forming **Group G** (*claim, cure*) are even further away from the ideal case of the expanded predicate, although their form is, again, no clear indicator of this fact as can be seen from e.g. (31):

(31) *If this one can do better, maybe he has some small claim to the name they've given him.* (hHT13)

The paraphrase is theoretically possible, but with a large influence on the meaning and dynamism of the action, the paraphrase adding much more dynamism to the stative constructions. The two examples are much closer to an object than to the expanded predicate construction, reflected also in the fact that there are verbo-nominal constructions also in the Czech translation equivalents.

The following two examples forming **Group H** form a contrast to **Group G**, namely in the fact that there is a verb in the Czech translation equivalent.

(32) *...but a grimy store, unadorned, that has the feel of raw materials.* (hLM22)

Example (32) may be compared to (28) in the shift of meaning towards an idiomatic expression, but *have a go* is more dynamic than (32) despite the fact that both have in the Czech translation equivalent a verb. At the same time, the examples of this small group show a contrast: Although they are both postmodified by an *of* construction, there is a difference in the articles. While in (32) there is the definite article with a standard cataphoric reference specified by the post-modifying phrase, (33):

(33) *...they've had a downpour of shooting stars!* (hPS12)

with its indefinite article seems to suggest the quantifying character of the phrase. It is also interesting that the object in the construction is a compound formed by an adverb which is followed by a verb, which is something that is not mentioned in any secondary literature on the topic of the expanded predicate constructions.

Group I represents an interesting mixture of the use of the item *dream* (4) and *daydream* (1) and presents a difficulty for classification. On the one hand, *daydream* seems the most regular-object-like example from all the occurrences, judging by replacement with the personal pronoun *them* in (34) and by the modification by an adjectival relative clause

in (35), both of which are never mentioned as possible in studies on the expanded predicate construction.

(34) ... *the daydreams were like when she did have them.* (hLM18)

(35) *He rolled onto his back and tried to remember the dream he had been having.*
(hPS01)

On the other hand, the possibility of paraphrase is quite strong in all the examples with *dream*, e.g. (35) could be paraphrased by

(36) *He rolled onto his back and tried to remember what he had been dreaming of.*

The last two examples (37) and (38) forming **Group J** are not strictly speaking expanded predicates anymore due to the fact that they do not appear in the syntactic position of a direct object, a condition set in 2.2.3.

(37) ...*William's style has a lot of adolescent roughhouse...* (hLM05)

(38) ...*even people like Ron didn't have much of a head start.* (hPS11)

Still, they are worth mentioning with respect to their form. They both appear in *of* construction dependent on the partitive head *a lot of* and *much of*.

4.1.2. Take

The ninety occurrences with the verb *take* were classified into ten groups, forming a scale from the central examples of the expanded predicate to those which deviate from the formal conditions listed at the end of the second chapter. The largest group, **Group A**, comprising twenty-eight occurrences, represents central examples of the expanded predicate which satisfy all the set formal tests. All the other groups are less numerous, **Group F** having the highest number of occurrences.

Due to the large number of examples in **Group A**, the lexical items in the position of the eventive object are listed in alphabetical order in the table below with the most frequent examples in bold.

Table 3

TAKE Group 1	HT	LM	PS	Total
bath		4		4
bite	1		1	2
break		1		1
counsel	1			1
drink			1	1
fall	1			1
gulp			1	1
jump			1	1
look	1	2	2	5
nap		1		1
shape		1		1
shower		2		2
stand	1			1
swig			1	1
swipe			1	1
turn			1	1
view			1	1
Total	5	11	10	26

The analysis of the table shows that the most frequent items which take the position of the eventive object are *bath* (4), *shower* (2), *look* (5) and verbs of consumption, *bite*, *drink*, *gulp*, *swig* which have five occurrences in total. This group, like the first group with the verb *have*, is not homogenous. There are central examples, e.g.

(39)...*he nevertheless took a thoughtful look at Hugh Beringar*, (tHT12)

which satisfies all the formal tests and acquires the specific meaning typical for the expanded predicate, namely singling out an event when compared to the paraphrase

(40) *He looked at him thoughtfully*,

reflected also in the Czech translation equivalent *zamyšleně si prohlédl*. Next to this example, there are two cases with *look* in which the indefinite article is replaced by the numeral *one* which has quantifying function and strengthens the feature of singling out an event.

A more problematic example is represented by the occurrences with *bath*, e.g.

(41) *She should take a bath*. (tLM03)

since the objection of the existence of the verb *bathe* might be raised. According to *Longman Exams Dictionary*, there are two phonological variants with a difference in spelling of both the noun and the verb: *bathe* and *bath*. *Bathe* /beið/ as a verb is used especially in American English, used both transitively and intransitively. In British English the transitive variant is used, but the intransitive variant is old-fashioned. *Bathe* exists also as a noun

in British English, but is also old-fashioned [“Bathe,” *Longman Exams Dictionary*]. *Bath* /ba:θ/ as a verb is listed as the British English variant, used both transitively and intransitively. The noun *bath* seems not to be tied to any of the variants [“Bath,” *Longman Exams Dictionary*]. It is the existence of the intransitive variant *bath* that was the decisive factor in listing the example in the **Group A**.

In addition, the example

(42) *Take a break and enjoy yourself.* (tLM02)

seems on the one hand to satisfy the formal tests, *break* being in this sense an intransitive verb. Even though the item still allows modification, e.g..

(43) *take a short break*

and theoretically allows a paraphrase, it would sound much less polite and unidiomatic, as Section 2.3.1 mentions, as there seems to be a shift to a more idiomatic meaning, which is supported by the Czech translation equivalent: *Odfoukni si[.]*

Group B represents the occurrences with alternation, phonological and morphological. The lexical items appearing in this group are: *breath* (3), *thought* (3), *flight* (2), *seat* (1) and *offence* (1). These examples are analogous to **Group D** in the list of the verb *have*. They do not satisfy the conditions due to alternation, but semantically they are very close to **Group A**. The example closest on the scale to the central expanded predicate is *breath*, very similar to the pair *bath/bathe*:

(44) *Harry took a deep breath and picked up the smallest.* (tPS23)

The only difference is that there is no verb *breath* /breθ/, only the variant /bri:ð/, semantically there seems to be no difference, which recalls the notion of gaps in the realization of structural possibilities described in more detail in Section 2.3.

Group C contains nine occurrences with the lexical items *chance* (3), *pick* (1), *revenge* (1), *risk* (1), *pride* (1) *heed* (1) and *side* (1). These represent the feature of the expanded predicate which is described in detail in Section 2.3.2 which allows paraphrasing a transitive verb. In these examples, the direct object shifts and may become the quantifier, determiner, or post-modifier of the eventive object, or in some cases disappears. To illustrate this, we may look at (45):

(45) *He was taking no chances.* (tHT01)

Chance does exist both as an intransitive and transitive verb, but in this meaning it is transitive, so the paraphrase would be:

(46) *He was not chancing anything.*

Here, the direct object is shifted to a negative quantifier *no* having the function of a determiner.

In addition, the example (47) in this group seems to be a fixed expression in this case.

(47) *Jordan was finding it difficult not to take sides.* (tPS13)

When compared to (42) from the **Group A**, where the possibility of modification is quite strong, here it is impossible.

Group D contains only the lexical item *step* in the position of direct object syntactically which occurred nine times in total. Although the formal structure is the same in all the examples, there are differences worthy of mentioning. Most of them fulfil the central criterion in that they may be paraphrased, so e.g.

(48) *Harry tried to take a step backward.* (tPS24)

may be paraphrased into

(49) *Harry tried to step backward*

without any difficulties. The expanded predicate construction here permits quantification, as well as emphasizes the even singled out. This is also reflected in the Czech translation equivalent in the aspect of the verb: *Harry se pokusil ustoupit o krok zpátky*. On the whole, the example could very well be transferred into the first group.

Yet at the same time, there are constructions which theoretically do allow paraphrase, but it is imperfect in that it affects the other lexical items in the sentence:

(50) *She will take one step at a time.* (tLM24)

(51) *She will step one by one.*

Compared to (48) which describes a single event singled out, (50) refers to a process, where the next stage is begun only when the previous is completed. Although this exact simple sentence is not translated into Czech, the meaning is apparent from the sentence that appears in the translation equivalent:

(52) *Když se jí ruce přestanou třást, udělá si toust a natře si na něj arašídové máslo. Zpátky do reality.*

It comprises three clauses happening in chronological order, one commencing after the previous has been finished.

In addition, there are two examples with ordinal numerals, (53) and (54).

(53) *He will take the first step today, now.* (tLM27)

(54) *[I]t could take the first wary steps now.* (tHT31)

The paraphrase for (53) would sound awkward and imperfect due to the shift in meaning of the verbo-nominal construction:

(55) *He will step for the first time today, now*

or

(56) *He will step first today, now.*

Nevertheless, it is still possible in contrast to (54), in which case the paraphrase is ruled out due to the fact that the subject is non-agentive in contrast to the agentive subject in (54), a contrast mentioned in Section 2.2.1. This is the same opposition as in the examples (12) and (13) listed in the analysis of eventive objects in the combination with the verb *have*.

Group E consists of the occurrences with *leave*. It was classified as a separate group on the one hand due to its size, and on the other hand due to the high idiomaticity of the examples, although there is variation in meaning among the examples as well. It is notable that all of the examples always occur with possessive pronouns in the determinative function, a fact which goes against the condition set in Section 2.3.1.

The variation in the group may be perceived by comparing examples (57) and (58), although the English formal structure gives no sign of a difference in meaning.

(57) *Still, he had extracted all he could, and prepared to take his leave.* (tHT02)

(58) *He took his leave almost reluctantly...* (tHT03)

The difference is not obvious from the English examples; even the paraphrase seems to change the meaning in the same manner given by the idiomatic character of the examples. It is only after comparing the Czech translation equivalents of these two examples that the difference can be perceived.

(59) *Nicméně vyžískal, co mohl, a chystal se k odchodu*

(60) *Loučil se skoro neochotně...*

Based on the comparison, (57) seems to retain the original meaning in contrast to (58) and all the other occurrences. Therefore, only the paraphrase of (57) should be permitted:

(61) *Still, he had extracted all he could, and prepared to leave.*

Group F is the second most numerous of all, although it comprises only the lexical item *care*, which appeared in the three novels nineteen times in total. In these cases, the light verb highlights the dynamic nature of the verbo-nominal construction as opposed to the paraphrase with *care* in the predicate position. It is notable that while there are only two cases of modification, twelve occurrences are postmodified by *of*-construction. Only one example is determined by the negative quantifier *no*. Furthermore, in five cases there is an infinitive following the expanded predicate, e.g. (62), which is in Czech translated once as an infinitive (63), once as a main clause (65) and twice as a subordinate clause, e.g. in (67).

(62) *Which Elizabeth has taken care to emphasize.* (tLM12)

- (63) *Což si Elizabeth dala tu práci zdůraznit.*
- (64) *His shameless mother takes care to point out this meaning.* (tLM13)
- (65) *Jeho nestydatá matka si dávala tu práci a na etymologii toho slova kdekoho upozorňovala.*
- (66) *[S]he'd taken care never to divulge her lovers[.]* (tLM15)
- (67) *[O]na si už ohlíkala, aby své milence neprozradila[.]*

Even within the group, the combination of the light verb *take* and the syntactic object *care* has a different level of idiomaticity, which is reflected in the number of different paraphrases in the Czech translation, which form a group of following verbs, sorted primarily according to number of occurrences and alphabetically as the second criterion: *postarat se o něco/někoho* (6), *dát si pozor* (2), *dát si práci* (2), *dát na sebe pozor* (2), *dbát o něco* (1), *dokázat zabít* (1), *ohlídat* (1), *nestarat se o někoho* (1), *starat se o něco* (1), *zacházet s čím* (1), *zanedbávat* (1).

This enumeration supports the fact that the most idiomatic expression of these occurrences is the example *take care of somebody* in the meaning *to kill somebody*:

- (68) *evil curse touches yeh --took care of yer mum an' dad an' yer house,* (tPS05)

This is the most extreme of the examples and cannot be paraphrased in English due to the change of meaning that would occur, although this is not implied by the formal structure at all.

The second example which cannot be paraphrased is (69), which is the only one with the form of an imperative.

- (69) *"Take care of yourself," she says.* (tLM14)

Its meaning is fixed, although modification still seems possible:

- (70) *Take good care of yourself.*

Nevertheless, the paraphrase is not possible due to the loss of the feature of a deliberate dynamic action as well as the formulaic character of the phrase. The phrasal character is also reflected in the Czech translation equivalent, which translated this occurrence as: *Dej na sebe pozor*. In addition, this example occurs also in the intransitive use in (71):

- (71) *Good luck -- take care.* (tPS22)

In this case, the verbo-nominal construction allows paraphrasing a transitive verb intransitively.

The paraphrase of the occurrences followed by an infinitive seems to be plausible, e.g.

- (64) *His shameless mother takes care to point out this meaning* (tLM13)

may be paraphrased into

(72) *His shameless mother cares to point out this meaning.*

The paraphrase is possible, but loses the dynamic character of the verb *take* in the expanded predicate.

The rest of the examples comprising in the Czech translation equivalent verbs *starat se*, *nestarat se*, *postarat se*, *zanebávat* generally allow a paraphrase by the prepositional verb *care for*. From this it follows that there is a change in the formal structure: The postmodification of the nominal part *care* of the verbal part of the verbo-nominal construction changes into a complement of the preposition *for*, [CGEL: 1156] e.g.:

(73) *Charlie can take care of him* (tPS16)

may change into

(74) *Charlie can care for him.*

Nevertheless, the meaning is changed in that the focal emphasis shifts and the dynamic feature of the verb *take* is lost. In addition, ambiguity may arise as the verb *care for* may be interpreted as *love* or *like* rather than *look after*.

Group G contrasts two occurrences of the lexical item *measure* which are determined by a possessive pronoun. Structurally they are the same, and both allow a paraphrase, but from the context it is obvious (76) is metaphorical use of the construction:

(75) *They must have been moving alongside us in cover, taking our measure[.]* (tHT08)

(76) *[S]he's a girl, and a fine one, and has already taken his measure.* (tHT22)

This is also supported by the Czech translation equivalents, in which the verbs are translated as *odhadovali si nás* in (75) and *má na něho políčeno* in (76). It is interesting that in this case the metaphorical sense seems not to put any constraint on the possibility of the paraphrase, while it does so in a different case with the metaphorical use, e.g.

(77) *If he could run he'd feel better, he could take hold, he knows it.* (TLM21)

Group H is formed by three occurrences of the construction *take hold*, which seems analogous to the **Group E** in classification of the verb *have* in the fact that there is no determiner or modifier, although *Longman Exams Dictionary* lists examples of the expanded predicate in which both are present. This lack of a determiner opposes the third condition mentioned in Section 2.3.1 We may argue that these occurrences are further away from the prototypical expanded predicate and that they have a fixed character nearing the phrase *take place* described in Section 2.2.3. *Take hold* however still retains the possibility of paraphrase whereas *take place* cannot be paraphrased and is understood as a single lexical unit. We may say:

(78) tLM22 *Auntie Muriel took hold of her arm*

just as well as:

(79) *Auntie Muriel held her arm*

without any drastic change to the meaning of the phrase, even though the expanded predicate construction in this case singles out an event in contrast to the paraphrase. The fact that this case retains at least partly the features of the expanded predicate construction is also supported by the Czech translation equivalent, in which the feature of singling out an event is reflected in the aspect of the verb.

Nevertheless, among the three formally identical occurrences there is one which is exceptional, namely (80):

(80) [*H*]e *could take hold*, he knows it. (tLM21)

In this case the paraphrase is possible from the structural perspective. However, from the semantic perspective it is impossible, since this occurrence is metaphorical and the element of the purposeful dynamic action mentioned in Section 2.2.1 would disappear. This is reflected in the Czech translation, which translates (80) as *získal by nad sebou kontrolu*. In contrast to that the other two occurrences translate the verb as *chytila* and *uchopil*.

There are three occurrences of the item *vow* which form **Group I**. All of them appear modified by the adjective *final* and one of them occurs in combination with a determinative possessive pronoun. It is notable that in these examples, the meaning of the construction is shifted in such a manner that a paraphrase would change it and sound awkward:

(81) *The young man had no taken his final vows*. (tHT32)

(82) *The young man had not vowed finally*.

In this sense the *final vows* seem to be a fixed expression which cannot be paraphrased, though the paraphrase of a construction *take a vow* seems plausible. The fact that the occurrences appearing in the text have the character of a fixed expression is further supported by the Czech translation equivalent which is not a single verb but a verbo-nominal expression *Mladý muž ještě nepřijal konečné sliby*.

There is only one occurrence of *take* in combination with the lexical item *interest* listed under **Group J**:

(83) *None of the dinosaurs takes the slightest interest in her*. (tLM25)

This is the only one occurrence of a construction formally resembling the expanded predicate, while the paraphrase is adjectival (*be interested*). This occurrence is analogous to the third group in the classification of the verb *to have*.

4.2. Determination and modification

The examples were found to display variation in the use of determiners and modifiers. Since the use of the determiners may contribute to distinguishing the syntactic types, and the modifiers may be of interest from the translation point of view, this chapter analyzes the findings with respect to determination and modification. The findings are summarized in Table 4 *have* and in Table 5 for *take*.

Table 4

HAVE	HT		LM		PS		Total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
no D (+ of)	4	23.53	4	20	0	0	8	16.67
a/an (+ of)	3	17.65	7	35	7	63.64	17	35.42
the (+of)	2	11.76	2	10	2	18.18	6	12.5
other (+of)	8	47.06	7	35	2	18.18	17	35.42
Total	17	100	20	100	11	100	48	100
MODIFICATION	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
D/Q + no M	8	47.06	8	40	6	54.55	22	45.83
no D/Q + no M	1	5.88	4	20	0	0	5	10.42
D/Q + M (+ of)	5	29.41	8	40	5	45.45	18	37.5
no D/Q + M (+ of)	3	17.65	0	0	0	0	3	6.25
Total	17	100	20	100	11	100	48	100

Table 5

TAKE	HT		LM		PS		Total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
no D (+ of)	12	35.29	13	44.83	5	18.52	30	33.33
a/an (+ of)	6	17.65	10	34.48	19	70.37	35	38.89
the (+ of)	1	2.94	3	10.34	0	0	4	4.44
other (+ of)	15	44.12	3	10.34	3	11.11	21	23.33
Total	34	100	29	100	27	100	90	100
MODIFICATION	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
D/Q + no M	13	38.24	10	34.48	13	48.15	36	40
no D/Q + no M	7	20.59	5	17.24	2	7.41	14	15.56
D/Q + M (+ of)	9	26.47	6	20.69	9	33.33	24	26.67
no D/Q + M (+ of)	5	14.71	8	27.59	3	11.11	16	17.78
Total	34	100	29	100	27	100	90	100

The first half of Tables 4 and 5 summarizes the occurrences of determiners (articles or other formal means), which are mentioned in Section 2.3.1. There were four major types found in the results, represented by the four lines.

The first line indicates the presence of no determiner which implies a high degree of lexicalization (multi-word verbs) of certain examples, a fact which was already hinted at in Section 4.1, e.g.

(71) *Good luck -- take care.* (tPS22)

The second line indicates the use of the indefinite article, as well as the zero article and the numeral *one* for semantic reasons:

(84) *He sat down next to Harry, took one look at him and burst into tears.* (tPS25)

From (84) it is obvious that the numeral is used only to strengthen the quantification of the expanded predicate, but semantically is the same as an indefinite article, supported also by the Czech translation equivalent:

(85) *Posadil se vedle Harryho, podíval se na něj a pak se rozplakal.*

However, both the zero article and the numeral *one* appeared only marginally, the numeral appearing in only three examples with the verb *take*.

The third line covers examples with the definite article, e.g.

(13) *A little mischief in it, Hugh judged, content to be an onlooker and have the best view of the game, but no malice.* (hHT11)

Finally, the fourth line comprises mostly pronouns in the determinative function and also the negative quantifier *no*, e.g.

(57) *Still, he had extracted all he could, and prepared to take his leave.* (tHT02)

The second half of the table focuses on the use of modification, a feature described in detail in Section 2.3.1. Despite the special character of the expanded predicate its syntactic pattern is still SVO with a noun phrase realizing the object. Therefore structural possibilities of the syntactic object presuppose a determiner, a modifier, the head and a post-modifier, all of which, excluding the head which must be present, may be or may not be filled with various consequences for the semantics of the phrase, its syntactic behaviour and the translation equivalents. These shall be discussed later. Since the number of examples considered is relatively small, the cases with modification and postmodification are always subsumed in one group in order for us to be able to make relevant general conclusions regarding modification.

The first line of the second half indicates the presence of a determiner (D) or a quantifier (Q) with no modification present.

(1) *He went to have a look.* (hPS04)

The zero article is also subsumed in this group.

The second line indicates the presence of no determiner or quantifier with no modification present, e.g. as in the case of (71). The third line contains occurrences with determiners or quantifier with modification present, e.g.

(86) *He'd take a brisk shower[.]* (tLM01)

Finally, the fourth line contains modified examples with no determiner or quantifier, e.g.

(87) *...that scream took final shape...* (tLM20)

It is important to mention that the examples occurring with the verb *have* not all have been analyzed: The last two examples forming **Group J** have been omitted in the analysis due to the fact that they have been included only because of their exceptional form which was notable enough to mention them, but they cannot be considered eventive objects due to their formal structure. Therefore, the analysis dealt only with forty-eight examples. As for the verb *take*, all examples have been included in the analysis.

The most frequent type of eventive object occurring has the indefinite or zero article in the position of determiner, occurring in 35.42% with *have* and in 38.89% with *take*. These are the eventive objects of the prototypical type based on the formal tests and semantic features, allowing quantification of the action and easier modification of the phrase, as well as to single out the event in contrast to the paraphrase, e.g. (1).

However, with *have* this result is similar to the presence of other determiners, e.g. possessive pronouns, which represent the exactly same percentage of occurrence, 35.42% in contrast to *take*, where this item is only the third most frequent with 23.33%. This suggests that 35.42% of the examples with the verb *have* 23.33% with *take*, while retaining some features typical for the eventive object, near true objects in their nature.

The second most frequent type of determiner appearing with both *have* and *take* is no determiner, in 16.67% with *have* and in 33.33% with *take*. The relatively high percentage is caused by the fact that our analysis did not focus merely on central eventive objects, but took

into account also examples, where the boundary between an eventive object and a fixed expression is often not clear-cut and the example retained characteristics of both, e.g. (87) and (88)

(87) ...*that scream took final shape*... (tLM20)

(88) *We have need of every son of the house*[.] (hHT03)

The smaller difference in percentage with the verb *take* between no determiner (33.33%) and the indefinite or zero article (38.89%) as opposed to the verb *have* suggests that *take* creates far more fixed expressions and that the syntactic objects tend to be lexicalized twice as often with *take* rather than *have*.

Finally, with both verbs, the least frequent type of objects are those occurring with the definite article, in 12.5% with *have* and in 4.44% with *take*. This is logical given the nature of the expanded predicate construction and confirms the hypothesis that the definite article is exceptional, as is stated in Section 2.3.1. The definite article appears only in examples whose determiner is motivated by the cataphoric reference, e.g.

(89) *Who'll take the chance of investing?* (tLM26)

or they are motivated by the use of an ordinal numeral or, in one case, of the superlative form:

(53) *He will take the first step today, now.* (tLM27)

(83) *None of the dinosaurs takes the slightest interest in her.* (tLM25)

Despite the fact that one of the most frequent reasons why the expanded predicate is used is because it allows easier modification, stated in Section 2.3.1, the majority of examples in the text occur with only with a determiner: 45.83% with *have* and 40% with *take*. Modified examples with a determiner are the second most frequent in the texts: they occur in 37.5% with *have* and in 26.67% with *take*. The third most common are the examples without determiners, i.e. those that are on the verge between syntactic objects and fixed expression. The only difference between the verbs is that with *have*, it is the non-modified examples that take the third position with 10.42% and with *take* it is the modified examples with 17.78%. From this it follows that the least used type occurring with *have* is the modified object with no determiner: 6.25%, and with *take* the non-modified object with no determiner: 15.56.

The determination and modification of the eventive objects finds different expression in the Czech translation equivalents. Due to space restrictions of this work it is not possible to go into too much detail. Therefore only general tendencies will be summed up.

The presence of no determiner suggests that the verbo-nominal construction is a fixed expression with various degree of idiomaticity and forms one semantic unit despite its bipartite

form [MSA: 81]. In Czech these examples from the texts correspond most frequently to one-word equivalents as in (91) or they are translated by a structurally completely different phrase which corresponds to the English example semantically, as in (92) and (93)

(90) *...the bird he desired with all his narrow might to ensnare had taken flight to a safe distance.* (tHT35)

(91) *...ptáček, kterého vši svou malou mocí toužil polapit, uprchl do bezpečné vzdálenosti.*

(92) *If he could run he'd feel better, he could take hold, he knows it.* (TLM21)

(93) *Kdyby mohl pravidelně běhat, cítil by se líp, získal by nad sebou kontrolu, ví to.*

The indefinite article, i.e. the examples of the prototypical eventive objects, and examples with quantifiers are reflected in the aspect of the Czech verb, which influences its morphological structure. This confirms the hypothesis stated in Section 2.3.1 Formal features. Therefore, the paraphrase of the verbo-nominal construction influences the aspect of the verb of the Czech translation equivalent as well. This can be proved on the following example and its Czech translation equivalent.

(94) *The giant took a gulp of tea[.]* (tPS04)

(95) *Obr usrkl veliký doušek čaje[.]*

If we paraphrase the clause into the past simple

(96) *The giant gulped the tea,*

the Czech translation changes the verb into:

(97) *Obr srkal čaj.*

The prefix *u-* disappears, reflecting the loss of the indefinite article which represents quantification of the action, the single event of the action as opposed to the paraphrase, and the verbal form is created from the stem of the verb *srkat*, and not *usrknout*, where we can see a different suffix reflecting the non-perfective aspect.

The negative quantifier is notable in that it seems to produce different result for each verb. When used with the verb *take*, the quantifier is reflected in the prefix of the verb originating in the eventive object in the Czech translation equivalent, as opposed to examples with the verb *have*, where the translation equivalent is frequently a verbo-nominal construction with the verb *have*, which then takes on the negative prefix *ne-*. In fact, there is only one example, where the Czech translation equivalent is not a verbo-nominal construction. The opposition may be illustrated by the following examples and their translation equivalents:

(98) *She is also to be reckoned with, I have no fears for her.* (hHT12)

(99) *Musíme počítat i s ní, nemám o ni strach.*

(45) *He was taking no chances.* (tHT01)

(100) *Neriskoval.*

There seems to be no structural way in which the definite article would influence the Czech translation equivalent, but the number of examples in which it appears. In contrast to that, possessive pronouns appearing in the position of a determiner seem to correspond with reflexive verbs in Czech, although not always. For instance:

(101) *He took his stand sturdily[.]* (tHT13)

(102) *Rozkročil se[.]*

In this example the opposition between Czech and English works, but it seems not to work in examples with shifted meaning which also do not allow paraphrase, e.g. in

(81) *The young man had no taken his final vows.* (tHT32)

(103) *Mladý muž ještě nepřijal konečné sliby.*

Modification of the expanded predicate seems to be reflected most frequently by an adverb in the Czech translation equivalents, e.g. in

(39) *[H]e nevertheless took a thoughtful look at Hugh Beringar.* (tHT12)

(104) *[Z]amyšleně si prohlédl Hugha Beringara[.]*

However, when the Czech translation equivalent is a verbo-nominal construction as well, the paraphrase is an adjective modifying the nominal part:

(105) *"Starving," said Harry, taking a large bite out of a pumpkin pasty.* (tPS07)

(106) *"Málem hlady nevidím," přiznal Harry a ukousl si pořádný kus dýňové paštičky.*

There are two very interesting examples of modification, both coming from *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*.

(10) *Harry and Dudley promptly had a furious but silent fight over who would listen at the keyhole.* (hPS05)

(107) *Harry a Dudley se v tu chvíli zuřivě, ale ve vši tichosti poprali o to, kdo bude poslouchat klíčovou dírkou.*

(108) *Harry then did something that was both very brave and very stupid: He took a great running jump and managed to fasten his arms around the troll's neck from behind.* (tPS11)

(109) *Vtom Harry udělal něco, co bylo velice statečné, ale také velice pošetilé: rozběhl se, skočil - a podařilo se mu oběma rukama zezadu chytit trolla kolem krku.*

The example (10) is interesting in its combination of adjectives in the adversative relation, which is also retained in the Czech translation equivalent. Example (108) is exceptional because the adjective modifying the eventive object, as well as the eventive object itself are transformed

into separate verbs which semantically imply consecutive actions. The adjective *great* is left out altogether from the translation.

There are not enough examples of postmodification to make any conclusive statements, but it seems that the post-modifying element becomes most frequently the object, either with or without a preposition, as in (24), (110), or marginally an infinitive (74), (111) or an attribute expressed by postmodification (94), (95).

(24) *We have need of every son of the house...* (hHT03)

(110) *Potřebujeme každého syna našeho domu...*

(89) *Who'll take the chance of investing?* (tLM26)

(111) *Kdo si teď troufne investovat?*

(94) *The giant took a gulp of tea[.]* (tPS04)

(95) *Obr usrkl veliký doušek čaje[.]*

5. Conclusion

The objective of the thesis was to describe the eventive object construction, including its functions, modification and Czech translation equivalents, as this construction is specific to English and reflects the analytic character of the language. In dealing with this type of construction, the major difficulty proved to be the identification of the expanded predicate construction, i.e. a light verb in the combination with a deverbal noun in the position of a syntactic object forming one semantic unit with the verb. The formal conditions which serve as formal tests to recognize this type of construction were listed in Section 2.4. As the most important of these was regarded the possibility of paraphrasing the verbo-nominal construction using the eventive object head noun as the verb in the paraphrase. Nevertheless, none of the formal test proved to be a sufficient guiding principle leading to the identification of all cases of the expanded predicate.

The 140 examples discussed in Chapter 4 fulfil the formal conditions to a varying degree and form a cline reflecting different tendencies of collocability and lexicalization or idiomaticity, as can be briefly exemplified by these occurrences:

- (1) *Maybe we can have lunch sometime.* (hLM11)
- (2) *Abbot Radulfus gave him a sharp glance, not altogether approving; and Robert Bossu gleamed into that brief, private, unnerving smile of his, that was gone before any target it might be aimed at could take offence.* (tHT30)
- (3) *Opat Radulfus po něm střílil ne právě schvalujícím pohledem a Robert Bossu zazářil svým krátkým, soukromým, znepokojivým úsměvem, který zmizel dřív, než se kdokoli, jemuž mohl být určen, stačil pohoršit.*
- (4) *...when a Powerful, evil curse touches yeh --took care of yer mum an' dad an' yer house...* (tPS05)
- (5) *Takový znamení ti zůstane, když na tebe šáhne nějaký mocný, zlý kouzlo - dokázalo zabít tvou maminku a tátu a zničilo váš dům...*

The verb *have* seems to collocate quite frequently with e.g. nouns of consumption, exemplified in (1). The tendency of some examples towards lexicalization can be seen in (2), where the head of the syntactic object in the verbo-nominal construction seems not to allow the presence of any determiner or modifier, and the Czech equivalent forming a verb in (3) seems to support the multi-word verb character of this construction rather than that of an expanded predicate. An extreme case of idiomaticity is shown in (4), where the verbo-nominal construction is translated into Czech as *zabít* in (5).

Despite the difficulties of classifying the examples, the largest group of examples represented the group of prototypical expanded predicates, e.g.:

(6) *He went to have a look.* (hPS04)

However, even among these examples there are instances which deviate e.g. in the use of a determiner and its function, although otherwise they look the same on the surface, which can be shown in example (7):

(7) *The toys he makes have this blank look, as if they can't see him.* (hLM19)

In contrast to (7), example (6) is unproblematic and conforms to the basic hypothesis that the use of an expanded predicate modifies the semantics of the sentence, i.e. namely the indefinite article serves not only as the means to single out an event in contrast to the paraphrase by the eventive object as the verb of the sentence, but also serves as the quantifier. On the other hand, example (7) has a demonstrative pronoun in non-generic definite cataphoric type of reference, which is specified by and occurs due to the following *as if they can't see him*. The eventive nature of this example is supported by the Czech translation equivalent *vypadají*. Even though employing merely the formal tests would not accept (7) as an example of expanded predicate, the semantics of the example argue for including it among the examples.

We also included examples with morphological alternation because from the semantic perspective these examples are very close to the central group, as in (8):

(8) *[H]e had a very particular use for her...* (hHT14)

In (8) there is a change in voicing of the final consonant in the noun-verb pair *use* /ju:s/ – *use* /ju:z/, but from the semantic perspective this example is an eventive object.

Another possible change which has been encountered is the difference in valency between the expanded predicate and its paraphrase:

(9) *He was taking no chances.* (hHT01)

Example (9) exemplifies the syntactic motivation of the use of the expanded predicate. It confirms the notion that the expanded predicate allows expressing a transitive verb meaning as intransitive. The expanded predicate then influences the distribution of the theme and rheme, the main focus in the sentence being on the last item of the sentence, the verb then representing the transition point between theme and rheme.

In other cases, the syntactic nature of the expanded predicate allows for a formal change in the means of introducing clause elements dependent on the verb. In example (10), the *of*-

postmodification of the eventive object would change into a prepositional object, as indicated in the contrast of (10) and (11):

(10) *Then they will have a lunch of creamed salmon on toast, with eggs grated on top.*

(hLM07)

(11) *Then they will lunch on creamed salmon on toast, with eggs grated on top.*

One of the semantic features of the expanded predicate is that it is dynamic and therefore implies an agentive initiator of the action. In some cases, there occurred a contrast between formally identical constructions, where the decisive factor of the paraphrase was either allowed or disallowed based on the presence or the lack of an agentive subject, as in the case of the following pair of examples:

(12) *They sit at a card table, the same card table on which they eat meals when they eat together, beside their picture window, which has a breathtaking view of the picture window in the apartment building opposite theirs.* (hLM06)

(13) *A little mischief in it, Hugh judged, content to be an onlooker and have the best view of the game, but no malice.* (hHT11)

In the case of (12) and (13), only (13) may be paraphrased due to the presence of an agentive subject which implies the dynamic use of the verb in contrast to (12) where the meaning is stative.

Another observed feature of the examples is the degree of idiomaticity or lexicalization or shift of meaning occurring in some of the verbo-nominal constructions. This shift of meaning tied to the verbo-nominal construction on the one hand cannot be deduced from the formal structure and on the other hand it implies that the central criterion, i.e. the paraphrase changes the meaning of the structure, as in (14):

(14) *He had not taken final vows.* (tHT32)

In some cases, the idiomaticity of the verbo-nominal construction may be deduced from the presence of no article which suggests the fixed character of the phrase, as in:

(15) *If he could run he'd feel better, he could take hold, he knows it.* (TLM21)

which is translated into Czech as:

(16) *Kdyby mohl pravidelně běhat, cítil by se líp, získal by nad sebou kontrolu, ví to.*

In addition to the lexicalized nature of some combinations, the examples differ in their object-like nature. Especially the examples with *dream* were difficult to classify because on the one hand they seem the most object-like in that they allow a replacement by the personal pronoun *them*, as in (17), and the modification by an adjectival relative clause in (18), both of which are never discussed in the studies on the expanded predicate construction

and open the matter for further discussion. On the other hand, the possibility of a paraphrase is quite strong in all the examples found.

(17) ...*the daydreams were like when she did have them.* (hLM18)

(18) *He rolled onto his back and tried to remember the dream he had been having.*
(hPS01)

The presence or the lack of a determiner, its kind as well as the presence of modification in the expanded predicate has a systematic influence on the semantics and the morpho-syntactic structure of the Czech equivalent. Due to the fact that the construction studied has the syntactic pattern SVO, the noun phrase constituting the syntactic object may be realized by all the constituents of a noun phrase: determiner, premodifier, head which must be present, and post-modifier. With the exception of the head of the noun phrase, all the other constituents may or may not be present with a systematic influence on the morpho-syntactic structure and the semantics of the Czech translation equivalents.

The indefinite article, the most frequent determiner with the occurrence of 35.42% with *have* and 38.89% with *take*, is reflected in the perfective aspect of the Czech verb, namely in its morphological structure:

(19) *The giant took a gulp of tea[.]* (tPS04)

(20) *Obr usrkl veliký doušek čaje[.]*

By paraphrasing the clause into the past simple we may observe the aspectual modification:

(21) *The giant gulped the tea,*

(22) *Obr srkal čaj.*

The prefix *u-* suggesting an incomplete action disappears due to the disappearance of the indefinite article and the verbal form of the translation equivalent is then created from the stem of the verb *srkat*, and not *usrknout*. The verbal form is then created from the stem of the verb *srkat*, and not *usrknout*, where we can see a different suffix reflecting the non-perfective aspect of the paraphrase.

No determiner, the second most frequent with both verbs occurring in 16.67% with *have* and in 33.33% with *take*, suggests that the verbo-nominal construction is a fixed expression with various degrees of idiomaticity, which forms one semantic unit. In Czech these examples correspond most frequently to one-word equivalents as in (23), or they are translated by a completely different phrase from the structural perspective, which however corresponds to the English example semantically, as in (15).

(23) ...*the bird he desired with all his narrow might to ensnare had taken flight to a safe distance.* (tHT35)

(24) ...ptáček, kterého vši svou malou mocí toužil polapit, uprchl do bezpečné vzdálenosti.

The negative quantifier *no*, when used with eventive objects after *take*, is reflected in the prefix of the verb originating in the eventive object in the Czech translation equivalent, as opposed to *have*, where the translation equivalent is frequently a verbo-nominal construction with the verb *have*, which takes on the negative prefix *ne-*

(25) *She is also to be reckoned with, I have no fears for her.* (hHT12)

(26) *Musíme počítat i s ní, nemám o ni strach.*

(9) *He was taking no chances.* (tHT01)

(27) *Neriskoval.*

The use of the definite article is rare, occurring in 12.5% with *have* and 4.44% with *take*. Based on the small number of examples with the definite article, there is no distinct way in which the definite article influences the Czech translation equivalent except for the type of reference.

In contrast to that, possessive pronouns in the position of determiners seem to correspond with reflexive verbs in Czech, although not in examples with shifted meaning, as in (30) and (31)

(28) *He took his stand sturdily[.]* (tHT13)

(29) *Rozkročil se[.]*

(30) *The young man had no taken his final vows.* (tHT32)

(31) *Mladý muž ještě nepřijal konečné sliby.*

Although the use of an expanded predicate increases the syntactic versatility over the paraphrase, especially the use of modifiers, these examples do not form the majority of the examples; they are the second most frequent with 43.75% with *have* and 44.45% with *take*. Usually, the translation equivalent is an adverb, e.g. in (33) or, less frequently, an attribute modifying the nominal part if the paraphrase is a verbo-nominal construction, as in e.g. (35):

(32) *[H]e nevertheless took a thoughtful look at Hugh Beringar.* (tHT12)

(33) *[Z]amyšleně si prohlédl Hugha Beringara[.]*

(34) *"Starving," said Harry, taking a large bite out of a pumpkin pasty.* (tPS07)

(35) *"Málem hlady nevidím," přiznal Harry a ukousl si pořádný kus dýňové paštičky.*

The post-modifying element seem to become most frequently the object, either with or without a preposition, as in (36), (37), or marginally an infinitive (38), (39) or an attribute expressed

by postmodification (19), (20). However, there did not occur enough post-modified examples to make any certain conclusions.

(36) *We have need of every son of the house...* (hHT03)

(37) *Potřebujeme každého syna našeho domu...*

(38) *Who'll take the chance of investing?* (tLM26)

(39) *Kdo si ted' troufne investovat*

(19) *The giant took a gulp of tea[.]* (tPS04)

(20) *Obr usrkl veliký doušek čaje[.]*

In conclusion, the eventive object construction represents an interesting phenomenon which would deserve a more detailed treatment, especially concerning the scalar character of the construction in relation to determiners, modifiers, etc. The next step needed would be a more systematic description of the relation of these types to the Czech translation, again with respect to determination, quantification and modification, collocability or lexicalization tendencies. It must be admitted that the task proved to be too complex to be covered within the limited scope of this thesis. However, the description confirmed the basic hypotheses stated in the introductory section of the thesis. It also highlighted some aspects which should be covered in a more systematic way and managed to show some correlations between the form of the eventive object and the Czech translation.

6. Bibliography

Algeo, John (1995) "Having a look at the expanded predicate." *The Verb in Contemporary English: Theory and Description*. Ed. Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 203-217.

Biber, Douglas, et al. (2006) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Dušková Libuše, et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

Gárate, Teresa Moralejo (2002) "Composite predicates and Modification flexibility in Middle English." *ATLANTIS* Vol. XXIV No. 1, 299-302.

Huddleston, Rodney, Geoffrey K. Pullum et al. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, Randolph, et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Renský, Miroslav (1964) "English Verbo-nominal phrases: some structural and stylistic aspects." *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague*, 1, 289-99.

Stein, Gabriele (1991) "The Phrasal Verb Type 'to have a look' in Modern English." *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 29, 1-29.

Longman Exams Dictionary. English ed. 2006.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1982) "Why can you have a drink when you can't *have an eat?" *Language* 58: 753-799.

7. Resumé

V úvodní kapitole je vymezeno téma práce, kterým je analýza v českém jazyce neexistující verbonominální konstrukce, která se skládá ze sémanticky vyprázdněného slovesa, v případě této práce slovesem *have* a *take*, v kombinaci s událostním předmětem, který má identickou formu se slovesem, se kterým je tento předmět sémantický příbuzný. Fakt, že tato dvoučlenná konstrukce tvoří jednu sémantickou jednotku, může být dokázán parafrází, kde událostní předmět nahradí sloveso a nedojde ke změně významu. Konstrukce je zajímavá zaprvé tím, že mění vid slovesa, což se odráží v českém překladu, a zadruhé umožňuje snadnější použití modifikátorů a kvantifikátorů, které se většinou překládají jako adverbia do češtiny, ale jejich integrace může činit problémy. Dále je v Úvodu uveden stručná charakteristika popisu obsahu a metody práce.

Ve druhé kapitole Teoretické pozadí jsou v první sekci vzhledem k jejich rozdílnosti shrnuty termíny, pod kterými je sledovaná konstrukce analyzována v odborné literatuře. V závěru se přikláníme k termínům „lehké sloveso“ vzhledem ke stručnosti termínu, „událostní předmět“ vzhledem k sémantickému hledisku a termínu „rozšířený predikát“ pro celou konstrukci vzhledem ke stručnosti termínu. Následující sekce 2.2. Prvky konstrukce je rozdělena podle částí, ze kterých se skládá sledovaná konstrukce.

V sekci 2.2.1 je vymezeno sloveso, jeho postavení ve větě a sémantický rozdíl mezi dynamickým a stavovým slovesem, resp. dynamickými a stavovými významy sloves, protože anglické sloveso je charakteristické tím, že to stejné sloveso může být v různém kontextu jak dynamické, tak stavové. Dále definováno sémanticky lehké sloveso. Hlavní formální změnou je rozložení jeho významu na dvě složky: První složkou, která nese gramatický význam ve větě, je sloveso. Druhou složku pak tvoří syntaktické substantivum, resp. hlava substantivní fráze, na kterou je přenesen vlastní význam. Následně jsou shrnuty informace o slovesech *have*, *mít* , a *take*, *vzít* a rozdíl mezi jejich použitím ve sledované konstrukci a jejich použitím jako lexikální sloveso. Dále je definován rozdíl mezi těmito slovesy v použití v „rozšířeném predikátu.“

V sekci 2.2.2 je definován předmět z hlediska formálního, sémantického a jeho postavení ve větě. Ve dvou následujících sekcích 2.2.2.2 a 2.2.2.3 je dále specifikován předmět přímý, který je kontrastován s předmětem nepřímým, od kterého se liší nejen postavením ve větě, ale i sémantickou rolí. Předmět nepřímý lze navíc většinou vynechat beze změny významu, ale vynecháním předmětu přímého se změní význam věty, neboť dojde k posunu nepřímého předmětu do pozice předmětu přímého. Dále také existuje možnost parafráze věty,

kde se předmět nepřímý stane předmětem předložkovým beze změny významu. Po shrnutí informací o přímém a nepřímém předmětu je vymezen událostní předmět, jeho syntaktické postavení ve větě, které je shodné s předmětem přímým, jeho formální a sémantické vlastnosti

Následující část 2.3. se věnuje konstrukci „rozšířeného predikátu“ jako celku. Je třeba si uvědomit, že skutečné realizace strukturního vzorce jsou různé a tvoří škálu různě idiomatických spojení. Navíc existují mezery v jednotlivých realizacích strukturních možností, které mohou být buď nahodilé nebo systematické. Dále jsou vymezeny formální charakteristiky konstrukce a podmínky, které stanovují podobu čistých příkladů „rozšířeného predikátu.“ Později je značná pozornost věnována důsledkům, jaké má použití této verbonominální konstrukce oproti parafrázi slovesem příbuzným událostnímu předmětu, větší dynamičnost, kvantifikace děje nebo rozdíl ve vidu, což je obzvlášť zajímavé pro porovnání s českými překladovými ekvivalenty. Dále jsou popsány důvody motivující použití „rozšířeného predikátu“ a použití s ohledem na variety a registry angličtiny. Nakonec jsou stanoveny formální testy, které jsou použity pro klasifikaci jednotlivých příkladů.

Kapitola 3 podává informace zaprvé o materiálu, který byl použit k analýze, a zadruhé vysvětluje metodu, která byla použita k získání 140 příkladů konstrukce. Materiál zahrnuje kromě sekundární literatury, která poskytla teoretické informace o konstrukci také tři romány použity přímo pro získání oněch 140 příkladů. Tyto romány byly současnými roditelými mluvčími angličtiny a jejich české překlady: *Harry Potter a Kámen mudrců* od J.K. Rowlingové, *Muzeum Zkamenělin* od Margaret Atwoodové a *Svatý zloděj* od Ellis Petersové. Pro analýzu byl použit již zmiňovaný software ParaConc, kde byly hledány výskyty sloves *have* a *take*, přičemž bylo nalezeno celkem padesát výskytů slovesa *have* a devadesát slovesa *take* v námi sledované konstrukci. Je zde také uvedena kvantitativní analýza, která podává informace o frekvenci výskytu obou sloves na 1 000 slov zvlášť pro každý román a celkově.

Kapitola 4 zahrnuje samotnou analýzu obou sloves. V podkapitole Syntaktické typy jsou z důvodu přehlednosti odděleny kapitoly pro každé sloveso zvlášť. Následně je proveden popis všech deseti skupin, do kterých byly jednotlivé příklady zařazeny pro každé sloveso. Vždy je nejprve uvedena obecná charakteristika skupiny, výčet událostních předmětů, které zde byly zahrnuty a následně jsou uvedeny vedle centrálních příkladů také zajímavé příklady, které jsou doprovázeny krátkým komentářem, např. skupina B u slovesa *have* ilustruje obtíž formálních kritérií stanovených v kapitole 2.4.. Jedná se o formálně stejné příklady, z čehož jeden lze a jeden nelze parafrázovat, což je zapříčiněno rozdílem v agentním podmětu: Pouze dynamické konstrukce, tedy věty s agentním podmětem lze parafrázovat. V podkapitole Determinace a modifikace je uveden přehled determinátorů a jejich výskyt jak v každém

románu, tak celkově, a zároveň je zde uveden procentuální přehled výskytu příkladů s modifikací či bez rozřídění podle přítomnosti nebo absence determinátoru. Následně jsou sledovány vlivy, jaké mají jednotlivé determinátory vliv na český překlad příkladů, stejně jako je popsáno, jaký má modifikace vliv na český překlad a konečně jakým způsobem.

V Závěru jsou shrnuty výsledky analytické kapitoly pro obě slovesa zároveň. Jsou zde shrnuty nalezené podtypy konstrukce a uvedeny základní příklady, které ilustrují typ a míru odchylky příkladů od centrálních případů sledované konstrukce. Dále jsou zde stručně uvedeny vlivy determinátorů a modifikace na české překladové koreláty.

Bibliografie uvádí seznam použité sekundární literatury seřazený abecedně a dodatková část obsahuje seznam všech nalezených příkladů obou sloves rozříděných do skupin.

8. Appendix

8.1. Have – list of examples

Group A			
1.	hLM07	Then they will [[have]] a lunch of creamed salmon on toast, with eggs grated on top, a dish suited to their limited budget.	Pak si k obědu dají kousky lososa na smetaně, podávané na toustu a posypané nastrohaným vařeným vajíčkem (takové jídlo utáhnou i se svým omezeným rozpočtem). Nate si bude hrát s vnoučaty a ona jediná bude v kuchyňce mýt nádobí a jako obvykle při tom cítit Chrisův dech na zátylku.
2.	hLM11	"Maybe we can [[have]] lunch sometime," he says at the living-r ...	„Možná bychom spolu mohli někdy zajít na oběd,“ prohodí ke dveřím obývacího pokoje.
3.	hLM12	Marianne habitually [[has]] lunch with Trish, who's off with the fl ...	Marianne obvykle chodí s Trish, tu ale sklátila chřipka.
4.	hLM13	Lesje is [[having]] lunch with Elizabeth's husband,...	Lesja obědvá s Elizabethiným manželem, mužem patřícím Elizabeth.
5.	hLM14	She isn't sure why she's [[having]] lunch with Elizabeth's husband at all, e ...	Není si jistá, proč s Elizabethiným manželem vůbec obědvá, ale možná to bylo cosi v jeho pozvání - byl to spíš výbuch -, co jí zcela zabránilo odmítnout.
6.	hPS10	Harry, who hadn't [[had]] any breakfast, leapt to his feet, but R ...	Harry, který neměl nic k snídani, okamžitě vyskočil, Ronovi však znovu zrudly uši a zamumlal, že s sebou má obložené chleby.
7.	hLM01	"We could [[have]] a drink sometime," he says abruptly.	„Někdy bychom mohli zajít na skleničku,“ navrhně náhle.
8.	hHT12	She is also to be reckoned with, I [[have]] no fears for her.'	Musíme počítat i s ní, nemám o ni strach.
9.	hLM19	... e and more, recently, the toys he makes [[have]] this blank look, as if they can't see him.	Poslední dobou ale hračky z jeho dílny vypadají čím dál víc takhle bezvýrazně, jako kdyby ho neviděly.
10.	hPS04	... large metal tub in the sink. He went to [[have]] a look. The tub was ...	Zdálo se, že pach vychází z velkého kovového škopku ve výlevce, a Harry si ho šel prohlédnout zblízka.
11.	hHT07	He [[had]] no wish to see someone of Prior Robert' ...	Vůbec si nepřál, aby se na slušnou domácnost Euda Blounta snesl někdo Robertova ražení a pátral způsobem naznačujícím temné podezření z přetvářky a krádeže.
12.	hHT09	Why so, if she [[had]] no wish to depart from you, and none to come and abide with us?'	Proč by to dělala, kdyby si nepřála od vás odejít a nepřála si přijít a zůstat u nás?"
13.	hLM16	She [[has]] no desire to hurt William.	Nemá nejmenší chuť Williamovi ublížit.

14.	hPS05	Harry and Dudley promptly [[had]] a furious but silent fight over who would listen at the keyhole.	Harry a Dudley se v tu chvíli zuřivě, ale ve vši tichosti poprali o to, kdo bude poslouchat klíčovou dírkou.
15.	hHT06	Rhun went whole, beautiful and lissome by Saint Winifred's gift, he would [[have]] no rest nor allow any to his superiors, while she was lost to him.	Rhun byl uzdraven a chodil krásně a pružně díky svaté Winifred, a nedá pokoj sobě ani svým nadřízeným, dokud bude ztracená.
16.	hLM04	... the water at less than body heat, as she [[has]] a fear of falling asleep in the tub.	Dbá na to, aby teplota vody nepřesáhla tělní teplotu, neboť se bojí, že ve vaně usne.
17.	hLM03	...so she [[has]] a natural distrust of secretaries.	Svou současnou funkci si zajistila příjemným hlasovým projevem po telefonu a tím, že o práci o jeden stupeň nad sebou věděla vždycky o něco víc než osoba, která tuto práci zastávala, takže sekretářkám nyní instinktivně nedůvěřuje.
18.	hHT08	I had thought I could [[have]] complete trust in you to get your charge safely home.	Myslel jsem, že se na vás mohu naprosto spolehnout, že bezpečně dopravíte domů, co jsem vám svěřil.
19.	hHT05	If she [[had]] no love for him, she [[had]] no hate, either ...	Neměla k němu sice žádnou lásku, ale ani nenávisť, dokonce poctivě uznávala, že jí jeho vyučování opatřilo prostředek k nezávislému životu, kdyby někdy objevila bezpečné místo, kde by jej mohla používat.
20.	hHT10	It is surely conceivable that she heard and [[had]] pity on us...	Jistě si lze představit, že slyšela a slitovala se nad námi...
Group B			
21.	hLM06	They sit at a card table, the same card table on which they eat meals when they eat together, beside their picture window, which [[has]] a breathtaking view of the picture window in the apartment building opposite theirs..	Sedí u karetního stolu, téhož karetního stolu, u něž spolu jedí, když už spolu jedí, vedle velkého okna skýtajícího úchvatný výhled na jiné velké okno v činžáku proti nim.
22.	hHT11	A little mischief in it, Hugh judged, content to be an onlooker and [[have]] the best view of the game, but no malice.	Je v tom trochu zlomyslnosti, usoudil Hugh, spokojený s úlohou diváka a s nejlepším pohledem na tu hru, ale žádná zloba.
Group C			
23.	hLM08	... taken her to the Museum, not because she[[had]] any interest in the things inside it but ...	Vyčítali to (samozřejmě mlčky) babičce Etlinové, která ji poprvé vzala do muzea, ne snad proto, že by ji něco z toho uvnitř zajímalo, ale proto, že to bylo levné a nepršelo tam.
24.	hLM15	Elizabeth, on the other hand, [[has]] no interest in watching	Elizabeth nemá zase vůbec žádnou potřebu sledovat jakékoli zprávy.

		any sort of news whatsoever.	
25.	hPS06	as though the happy balloon inside him [[had]] got a puncture. ...	Najednou mu napadlo něco, při čem měl pocit, jako by ten balon štěstí v jeho nitru někdo propíchl
Group D			
26.	hHT14	... id when first they rode in here, that he [[had]] a very particular use for her, as indee ...	"Ale třeba sis myslel, jako jsem si rozhodně myslel já, když sem první přijeli, že má pro ni zcela přesné použití, a to také má, ale ne takové, jak jsem si myslel."
27.	hHT15	Surely you don't suppose they'd [[have]] any use for her, even if they did have a cart on the Horse Fair.	Přece si nemyslíte, že by jim k něčemu byla, i když na Koňském trhu s vozem byli!
28.	hLM21	The ancients [[had]] other beliefs as well.	V dávných dobách se ovšem věřilo i jiným věcem.
29.	hHT16	'Then we'll go to Huncote, and [[have]] speech with the earl.'	"Pojedeme tedy do Huncote a promluvíme s hrabětem.
Group E			
30.	hHT01	Walter is back within the enclave, and [[has]] need of every son's labour and faith to ...	Někteří totiž ještě ani nemohou vědět, že je opat Walter zpátky v klášteře a potřebuje práci a víru každého syna, aby uskutečnil velké dílo obnovy.
31.	hHT03	We [[have]] need of every son of the house, and ever ...	Potřebujeme každého syna našeho domu a každého přítele řádu, aby nám pomohli napravit před Bohem to, co bylo znesvěceno.
32.	hHT04	... be done to restore our dwelling, and we [[have]] need of every hand that can be brought t ...	"Na obnovu našeho příbytku se však musí mnoho vykonat a potřebujeme každou ruku, která je nám ochotná pomoci.
Group F			
33.	hPS02	"You could just leave me here," Harry put in hopefully (he'd be able to watch what he wanted on television for a change and maybe even [[have]] a go on Dudley's computer).	"Mohli byste mě prostě nechat tady," navrhl Harry s nenadálou nadějí (aspoň jednou by se mohl v televizi dívat, nač by chtěl, a možná si i vyzkoušet Dudleyho počítač).
34.	hLM17	She lets her eyes slide over the bowls, over their subtle colors, their slightly asymmetrical curves, wonderful to [[have]] that sense, where to be off balance.	Oči jí tékají po miskách, po jejich rafinovaných barvách, lehce asymetrických křivkách, je báječné vědět, kdy je možné porušit rovnováhu.
35.	hLM20	He thinks she [[has]] an offbeat sense of humor.	Myslí si, že Lesja má nekonvenční smysl pro humor.
36.	hPS07	If Harry hadn't known that the Dursleys [[had]] no sense of humor, he might have though ...	Kdyby Harry nevěděl, že nemají smysl pro humor, býval by si to nejspíš myslel;
37.	hLM09	..of animal life with which Auntie Muriel [[has]] ever	Dál následují švábi, moli, rybenky a bakterie, jež představují prakticky jediné

		had any contact.	živočišné druhy, s nimiž se kdy tetička Muriel setkala.
38.	hLM02	... Muriel and the Queen, with Auntie Muriel [[having]] a slight edge.	Pak následuje tetička Muriel a královna, přičemž tetička Muriel má mírný náskok.
Group G			
39.	hHT02	... face about the use of the church, for he [[has]] the cure of souls in the parish of Holy ...	Urychlíme veškerá opatření, která si budete přát podniknout, domluvíme se s otcem Bonifácem o použití kostela, protože má na starost duše ve farnosti Svatého Kříže, a s Hughem Beringarem jako šerifem i se starostou a předákem kupeckého cechu z města ohledně vašeho shromáždění u Vysokého kříže v Shrewsbury.
40.	hHT13	If this one can do better, maybe he [[has]] some small claim to the name they've giv ...	Jestli to s ní tenhle bude umět líp, třeba má jistý malý nárok na jméno, které mu dali.
Group H			
41.	hLM22	... ques, but a grimy store, unadorned, that [[has]] the feel of raw materials.	není to jeden z těch koupelnových butiků, ale špinavý a ničím nepřikrášlený krám dýchající atmosférou materiálů v původním, nezpracovaném stavu.
42.	hPS12	... f the rain I promised yesterday, they've [[had]] a downpour of shooting stars! ...	Pozorovatelé z míst tak vzdálených navzájem jako je Kent, Yorkshire a Dundee mi během dne telefonovali, že místo deště, který jsem jim včera sliboval, viděli hotový liják meteorů!
Group I			
43.	hLM18	... at the daydreams were like when she did [[have]] them.	stejně tak si nemůže vybavit, jak to snění tenkrát vypadalo.
44.	hPS01	He rolled onto his back and tried to remember the dream he had been [[having]].	Převrátil se na záda a ještě zkusil vybavit si sen, který se mu před chvílí zdál.
45.	hPS03	I [[had]] a dream about a motorcycle," said Harry	"Mně se o jedné motorce zdálo," řekl Harry, jak si na to náhle vzpomněl
46.	hPS08	... rry had eaten a bit too much, because he [[had]] a very strange dream.	Možná toho opravdu snědl příliš, poněvadž se mu zdál prapodivný sen.
47.	hPS09	He had a funny feeling he'd [[had]] the same dream ...	Měl podivný pocit, že stejný sen se mu zdál už někdy dřív.
Group J			
48.	hLM05	William's style [[has]] a lot of adolescent roughhouse, she now ...	Dochází jí, že Williamův styl nese pečeť adolescentního hurá stylu, zatímco geolog na ni vždycky spěchal.
49.	hPS11	... learn that even people like Ron didn't [[have]] much of a head start.	a všichni se museli naučit tolika věcem, že dokonce ani takoví jako Ron neměli nijak velký předstih.

8.2. Take – list of examples

Group A			
1.	tLM04	... waiting for this comparative emptiness to [[take]] a close look at the exhibit, which opened ...	Záměrně si na tu relativní prázdnotu počkala, aby si mohla pořádně prohlédnout výstavu, která byla otevřena před čtyřmi dny, ale na niž si pro samou práci zatím neudělala čas.
2.	tLM05	"I guess she just wants to [[take]] a look at you," Nate said, "up close.	„Nejspíš si tě chce okouknout,“ odtušil Nate, „pěkně zblízka.
3.	tPS12	Quirrell [[took]] one look at the troll, let out a faint w ...	Ten na trolla jen krátce pohlédl, chabě něco zakňoural, spěšně se posadil na nejbližší záchodovou mísu a držel se za srdce.
4.	tPS25	He sat down next to Harry, [[took]] one look at him, and burst into tears.	Posadil se vedle Harryho, podíval se na něj a pak se rozplakal.
5.	tHT12	... favour of the clerical, he nevertheless [[took]] a thoughtful look at Hugh Beringar,	Přestože proti němu stála skupina, v níž převažovali duchovní, zamyšleně si prohlédl Hugha Beringara a raději oslovil zástupce světské spravedlnosti.
6.	tLM03	She should [[take]] a bath.	Měla by se vykoupat.
7.	tLM07	"You're [[taking]] a bath."	„Vykoupal ses.“
8.	tLM09	Once she [[took]] baths for pleasure;	Kdysi se chodila koupat už jen pro ten požitek, který z toho měla;
9.	tLM28	No doubt she's [[taking]] too many baths as well.	Bezpochyby to přehání i s těmi koupelemi.
10.	tLM01	He'd [[take]] a brisk shower, scrubbing himself with s ...	Obvykle se rázně osprchoval, vydrbal se jakýmsi středověkým flagelantským nástrojem, vynořil se z koupelny růžovoučký jako gumová kachnička, v kuchyni vyhrabal celozrnné pšeničné obilniny Shreddies, při tom si sušil hlavu ručníkem a podnikal občasné nájezdy do ložnice, kde Lesju popichoval a tahal jí z nohou peřinu.
11.	tLM06	... e's twice locked the bathroom door while [[taking]] a shower and once told him she had a ba ...	Není divu, že nadržný William nervózně přešlapuje, neboť se při sprchování zamkla v koupelně na dva západy a jednou mu řekla, že ji hrozně pálí žába.
12.	tPS07	"Starving," said Harry, [[taking]] a large bite out of a pumpkin pasty.	"Málem hlady nevidím," přiznal Harry a ukousl si pořádný kus dýňové paštičky.
13.	tHT11	Give me a moment to wet my throat and [[take]] a bite, and I'm ready!' ...	Dopřejte mi chvíličku, abych svlažil hrdlo a něco zakousl, a jsem hotov!"
14.	tPS03	... nd a bottle of some amber liquid that he [[took]] a swig from before starting to make tea. ...	Obr se znovu posadil na pohovku, která se pod jeho vahou celá prohnula, a začal z kapes kabátu vytahovat všechno možné: měděnou konvici, pomačkaný balíček s párky, rošt, čajník, několik otlučených porcelánových hrnečků a láhev jakési jantarové tekutiny, z které si důkladně přihnul, než začal chystat čaj.
15.	tPS04	The giant [[took]] a gulp of tea and wiped his mouth	Obr usrkl veliký doušek čaje a hřbetem ruky si otřel ústa.

		with t ...	
16.	tPS21	She [[took]] a long drink from the round bottle at th ...	Důkladně se napila z kulaté láhve na konci řady a zatřásla se.
17.	tPS02	“Every now and then Uncle Vernon would [[take]] a sharp turn and drive in the opposite d ...	Čas od času strýc Vernon najednou otočil a chvíli jel opačným směrem.
18.	tPS10	„Get out of the way,” snapped Ron, [[taking]] a swipe at Peeves this was a big mistak ...	"Uhni!" vyštěkl Ron a ohnal se po něm - to ovšem byla veliká chyba.
19.	tPS11	Harry then did something that was both very brave and very stupid: He [[took]] a great running jump and managed to fasten his arms around the troll's neck from behind.	Vtom Harry udělal něco, co bylo velice statečné, ale také velice pošetilé: rozběhl se, skočil - a podařilo se mu oběma rukama zezadu chytit trolla kolem krku.
20.	tLM08	... asually, suggested after lunch that she [[take]] an afternoon nap.	Mělo to být překvapení, ale ona se to dovítčila, jakmile jí Nancy čistě mimochodem začala vehementně přesvědčovat, aby si po obědě šla zdřímnout.
21.	tHT28	‘You [[took]] a heavy fall.	"Měla jste těžký pád.
22.	tPS14	... o came back the day before term started, [[took]] a different view of things. ...	Hermiona, která se vrátila den před začátkem druhého pololetí, se na to dívala jinak.
23.	tLM20	... line, when seven years later that scream [[took]] final shape and she made it totally, cal ...	V Carolinině případu se jednalo o něco jiného: když za sedm let nabyt její výkřik konečného tvaru a když se naprosto a katastrofálně ozřejmilo, co se snažila říct, byl to Boží soud.
24.	tHT09	... le - we first tended the worst hurt, and [[took]] counsel, and decided we must take the ne ...	"Víte, pane, když jsme zůstali sami -- a myslím si, že kdyby neměli tak naspěch, nezůstal živý ani jeden z nás, aby nic neprozradil --, nejdřív jsme ošetřili nejhorší rány, pak jsme se poradili a rozhodli, že musíme donést zprávu do Ramsey a také zpátky sem do Shrewsbury.
25.	tLM02	"[[Take]] a break and enjoy yourself."	„Odfoukni si a užij si to.“
26.	tHT13	He [[took]] his stand sturdily, folded his hands, an ...	Rozkročil se, založil ruce a podíval se na jednoho po druhém jako na přísedící soudu.
Group B			
27.	tPS01	He [[took]] a few deep breaths and then forced his f ...	Potom se párkrát zhluboka nadechl a vynutil ze sebe úsměv, který působil spíš ztrápeně.
28.	tPS19	He [[took]] a deep breath, covered his face with his...	Zhluboka se nadechl, zakryl si tvář rukama a vyrazil.
29.	tPS23	Harry [[took]] a deep breath and picked up the smallest.	Harry se zhluboka nadechl a uchopil nejmenší lahvičku.
30.	tPS27	...the key [[took]] flight again, looking very battered now ...	Ve chvíli, kdy se zámek s cvaknutím otevřel, klíč znovu odlétl; teď, když už ho dvakrát někdo chytil, vypadal věru zuboženě.

31.	tHT35	The news worked its way round by devious stages to the ears of Brother Jerome, that the bird he desired with all his narrow might to ensnare had [[taken]] flight to a safe distance.	Novina, že ptáček, kterého vši svou malou mocí toužil polapit, uprchl do bezpečné vzdálenosti, oklikami dospěla k uším bratra Jeronýma.
32.	tHT10	... down and halted the hunt for a while to [[take]] thought.	Přílišné vykřikování a bědování by vzbudilo jistou pochybnost o jeho upřímnosti, ale Herluin se očividně domníval, že nejde o nic horšího než o nějaký hloupý zmatek, způsobený příliš mnoha pomocníky a přílišnou panikou a spěchem, a že se ztracený poklad zase najde, až se všichni uklidní, přestanou hledat a trochu se zamyslí.
33.	tHT14	... ble that he did kill, but having killed, [[took]] thought to cover what he had done. ...	Je možné, že zabil a pak se zamyslel nad tím, jak to zakrýt.
34.	tHT15	Father Abbot, grant us today and tomorrow to set our minds in order, examine our claims and [[take]] thought to pray only for what is due to...	Otče opate, dopřejte nám dnešek a zítřek, abychom si srovnali myšlenky, prozkoumali své nároky a důkladně se zamysleli, abychom se modlili jen za to, co nám náleží.
35.	tHT18	...possible, and killed him, and only then [[took]] thought how to escape suspicion, and cam...	Přesto může být pravda, že tam přišel pouhých pár minut po Jeronýmovi útěku, našel Aldhelma jen omráčeného, shýbl se, poznal ho, protože v tu chvíli ho poznat mohl, zabil ho, a teprve pak uvažoval o tom, jak uniknout podezření, a při
36.	tPS26	... quet will begin shortly, but before you [[take]] your seats in the Great Hall, you will b ...	"Za chvíli začne slavnostní hostina na zahájení školního roku, ale ještě než zaujmete svá místa ve Velké síni, každého z vás zařadíme do některé koleje.
37.	tHT30	Abbot Radulfus gave him a sharp glance, not altogether approving; and Robert Bossu gleamed into that brief, private, unnerving smile of his, that was gone before any target it might be aimed at could [[take]] offence.	Opat Radulfus po něm střelil ne právě schvalujícím pohledem a Robert Bossu zazářil svým krátkým, soukromým, znepokojivým úsměvem, který zmizel dřív, než se kdokoli, jemuž mohl být určen, stačil pohoršit.
Group C			
38.	tLM23	... ively, grouping his men in tight clumps, [[taking]] no chances.	Hraje obranářsky, seskupuje své jednotky do semknutých houfců, nic neriskuje.
39.	tHT01	He was [[taking]] no chances.	Neriskoval.
40.	tLM26	... ill mean the end of the economy: Who'll [[take]] the chance of investing?	Někdo tvrdí, že tohle zasadí ekonomice smrtelnou ránu Kdo si teď troufne investovat?
41.	tLM29	"[[Take]] your pick."	„Vyberte si."

42.	tHT16	... talize and bewilder, why should not she [[take]] her own gentle revenge? ...	Pokud se jemu zachtělo dráždit a mást, proč by se mu jemně nepomstila po svém?
43.	tHT04	... expected to, for she kept herself apart, [[taking]] no risks, perhaps, with an exacting mas ...	Ještě ji takhle zblízka neviděl, ani to neočekával, protože se držela stranou; třeba u tak náročného pána nechtěla riskovat.
44.	tPS06	Enter, stranger, but [[take]] heed.	Vstup, cizinče, leč pamatuj:
45.	tPS13	Jordan was finding it difficult not to [[take]] sides.	Leemu Jordanovi bylo zatěžko zůstat nestranný.
46.	tHT19	His squires were prompt to his call, and soft-footed and neat-handed with flask and glass, and seemed to go in no awe of him, but rather to [[take]] pride in matching his poise and serenity;	Panoši se dostavovali ihned na zavolání, chodili tiše a uměli zacházet s lahví a sklenicemi, a zdálo se, že se ho nijak nebojí, ale spíš je jejich pýchou, že se chovají stejně vyrovnaně a klidně jako on;
Group D			
47.	tLM24	When her hands are steady she makes a piece of toast and spreads it with peanut butter. She will [[take]] one step at a time.	Když se jí ruce přestanou třást, udělá si toust a natře si na něj arašídové máslo. Zpátky do reality.
48.	tLM27	He will [[take]] the first step today, now.	První krok udělá dnes, teď.
49.	tPS08	... ng in midair ahead of them, and as Percy [[took]] a step toward them they started throwing ...	Ve vzduchu před nimi se vznášela hromada holí, a když Percy pokročil směrem k nim, začaly proti němu létat jedna za druhou.
50.	tPS15	... me as your enemy, Quirrell," said Snape, [[taking]] a step toward him. ...	"Musíte se rozhodnout, jestli budeme přátelé, anebo nepřátelé, Quirrelle," prohlásil Snape a pokročil k němu.
51.	tPS17	Harry had [[taken]] one step toward it when a slithering so ...	Harry k němu užuž chtěl vykročit, když tu náhle zaslechl šoupavý zvuk a ztuhl jako přimrazený.
52.	tPS18	He [[took]] a step forward and Neville dropped Trevor...	Pokročil k němu a Neville upustil žabáka Trevora, který jedním skokem zmizel do tmy.
53.	tPS20	I [[take]] one step forward and she'll take me	... Popojdu dopředu a ona mě vezme - ale ty budeš mít možnost dát králi mat, Harry!"
54.	tPS24	Harry tried to [[take]] a step backward but his legs wouldn't mo ...	Harry se pokusil ustoupit o krok zpátky, ale nohy ho neposlouchaly.
55.	tHT31	It would take more than a year for life to get back into any kind of normality, but at least now it could [[take]] the first wary steps.	Bude to trvat víc než rok, než se život vrátí k jakés takés normálnosti, ale nyní aspoň mohl dělat první opatrné krůčky.
Group E			
56.	tHT02	Still, he had extracted all he could, and prepared to [[take]] his leave.	Nicméně vyzískal, co mohl, a chystal se k odchodu

57.	tHT03	He [[took]] his leave almost reluctantly, looking ba ...	Loučil se skoro neochotně, ještě ze dveří se ohlížel, než pevně pokrčil rameny a odešel se podřídit Herluinovým příkazům a tak či onak se pokusit rozvázat měšce shrewsburských měšťanů.
58.	tHT17	... a shrug of his high shoulder, 'and should be about [[taking]] my leave here.'	Svůj malý nárok na světiči jsem ztratil," připomněl Robert Bossu se zářivým úsměvem a pokrčil svým vyšším ramenem, "a měl bych se s vámi pomalu loučit."
59.	tHT20	... s, in a day or so I must make ready and [[take]] my leave. I am glad ...	Ano, za den, za dva se musím sbalit a rozloučit.
60.	tHT21	Hugh [[took]] his leave, and was not pressed to remain ...	Hugh se rozloučil a hrabě na něho nenaléhal, aby zůstal, přestože ho formálně vyprovodil kousek ke dveřím domu.
61.	tHT27	My lord,' said the earl, 'I [[take]] my leave, now the time is come, with much ...	"Můj pane," promluvil hrabě, "nyní, když přišel čas, loučím se s velkou lítostí.
62.	tHT26	... I would not think of setting out without [[taking]] his leave of Hugh.	Hrabě s nejvyšší pravděpodobností nebude chtít odjet bez rozloučení s Hugem.
Group F			
63.	tLM10	But Caroline seemed to have already [[taken]] care of that herself.	Jenže Caroline se o to podle všeho již postarala.
64.	tLM11	Your wife doesn't [[take]] care of you.	Tvoje žena tě zanedbává.
65.	tLM12	Which Elizabeth has [[taken]] care to emphasize.	Což si Elizabeth dala tu práci zdůraznit.
66.	tLM13	His shameless mother [[takes]] care to point out this meaning.	Boží dar. Jeho nestydatá matka si dávala tu práci a na etymologii toho slova kdekoho upozorňovala.
67.	tLM14	"[[Take]] care of yourself," she says.	„Dej na sebe pozor,“ požádá ho a se skříňkou falešných knírků vykráčí z koupelny.
68.	tLM15	...worked with Nate and herself, and she'd [[taken]] care never to divulge her lovers until s..	Takhle to na počátku měla zařízené s Natem a ona si už ohlížela, aby své milence neprozradila, dokud nebyla připravená se jich vzdát.
69.	tLM16	She'd [[taken]] care not to speak to him or even see him ...	Dávala si pozor, aby s ním v pracovní době nemluvila, dokonce aby ho ani neviděla, pokud to bylo možné.
70.	tLM17	... n't want anything else she will have to [[take]] care of.	Nechce nic dalšího, oč by se musela starat.
71.	tLM18	... project she's promised herself she will [[take]] care of today.	Slíbila si, že se dnes postará o ještě jeden projekt.
72.	tLM19	Who else would [[take]] care of them?	Kdo jiný by se o ně postaral?
73.	tPS05	...when a Powerful, evil curse touches yeh --[[took]] care of yer mum an' dad an' yer house,	Takový znamení ti zůstane, když na tebe šáhne nějaký mocný, zlý kouzlo - dokázalo zabít tvou maminku a tátu a zničilo váš dům - ale s tebou nic nezmohlo, a právě proto jseš slavný, Harry.
74.	tPS09	... essor Sprout, where they	Třikrát týdně chodili do skleníků vzadu za

		learned how to [[take]] care of all the strange plants and fungi ...	hradem a pod vedením obtloustlé malé čarodějky, profesorky Prýtové, studovali bylinkářství: učili se, jak zacházet se všemi těmi podivnými rostlinami a houbami, a dozvídali se, k čemu se jich používá.
75.	tPS16	Charlie can [[take]] care of him and then put him back in the ...	Charlie se o něj může postarat a pak ho pustit na svobodu!"
76.	tPS22	"Good luck -- [[take]] care."	"Mnoho štěstí - dávej na sebe pozor -"
77.	tHT05	Where it's needful we [[take]] good care.'	Tam, kde je třeba, dáváme si dobrý pozor."
78.	tHT06	Surely she is well able to [[take]] care of herself and her flock...	Jistě se dovede postarat o sebe i o své stádo.
79.	tHT23	'He [[takes]] no great care of it.	"Moc se o ni nestará.
80.	tHT24	It could not be said that he had actually seen her, or heard any sound or movement; he had [[taken]] good care not to.	Nedalo se říci, že ji doopravdy viděl, nebo slyšel nějaký zvuk či pohyb; velmi pečlivě o to dbal.
81.	tHT25	I should have[[taken]] care of the matter myself rather than t ...	Raději jsem se o to měl postarat sám a nespolehat na jiné.
Group G			
82.	tHT08	They must have been moving alongside us in cover, [[taking]] our measure, and they had two archers ahead, one either side the track.	Určitě se pohybovali vedle nás schovaní v lese a odhadovali si nás, a vpředu měli dva lučištníky, po jednom z každé strany silnice.
83.	tHT22	'He has dreams now of delivering the only slave he's likely to encounter in these parts, though I doubt if he's fully realized yet that she's a girl, and a fine one, and has already [[taken]] his measure.'	„Ted' sní o tom, že osvobodí jediného otroka, kterého v těchhle končinách asi může potkat, přestože pochybuji, zda si už plně uvědomil, že je to dívka, a k tomu pěkná, a že už má na něho políčeno."
Group H			
84.	tLM21	If he could run he'd feel better, he could [[take]] hold, he knows it.	Kdyby mohl pravidelně běhat, cítil by se líp, získal by nad sebou kontrolu, ví to.
85.	tLM22	Auntie Muriel [[took]] hold of her arm, but she broke free and ...	Tetička Muriel ji chytila za ruku, ale ona se jí vytrhla, protáhla se kolem řady kolen a proběhla uličkou.
86.	tHT07	...ed a hand with ceremonious reverence to [[take]] hold of the last fold, and drew it back ...	Převor Robert s obřadnou uctivostí napřáhl ruku, uchopil poslední záhyb, odtáhl jej a odhalil, co leželo uvnitř.
Group I			
87.	tHT32	The young man had not [[taken]] his final vows.	Mladý muž ještě nepřijal konečné sliby.
88.	tHT34	He had not [[taken]] final	Nesložil konečné sliby.

		vows.	
89.	tHT36	'He has not yet [[taken]] final vows,' said Cadfael.	Ještě nesložil konečné sliby," připomněl Cadfael.
J: Interest			
90.	tLM25	None of the dinosaurs [[takes]] the slightest interest in her.	Ani jeden dinosaurus se o ni nijak nezajímá.